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## SHARON HARRIGFELD,

first duly sworn to tell the truth relating to said cause, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. SCHOPPE:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Thank you very much for coming.
A. You're welcome.
Q. I'm Andrew Schoppe. I represent the

Plaintiffs in this matter. Have you ever had your deposition taken before?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. Without telling me what you spoke about with your attorney, you've had an opportunity to meet with him and kind of go over the process?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. So, you understand that you're under an obligation to tell the truth just as if you were testifying in a courtroom; right?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Anything that might negatively impact your ability to testify, whether that be prescription medicines, fatigue, memory problems, anything like that?
A. No, sir.
Q. Generally speaking I'm entitled to your best answer. I'm looking for everything that you know. Anything that you might have seen, have heard, even if you heard it from someone else, I'd like to know who you might have heard that from so we can find out more about that.

If any of my questions are unclear to you at all, by all means feel free to say so and ask for a clarification or rephrasing or restatement. You're welcome to take a break and ask for a break if you wish so long as you've answered whatever question has been asked.

Can you tell me everything you did to prepare for today's deposition, please.
A. Well, I met with my attorney and reviewed some -- I reviewed Rhonda's deposition and I looked at some old stuff from the Nampa facility.
Q. What do you mean by "old stuff"?
A. I looked at -- I looked at some information that Tom Knoff wrote for us when he did -- we asked him to come down and he asked some questions of the Attorney General and so I looked at those.
Q. And what were those questions about?

MR. COLLAER: Just a moment. I need to
clarify something. If he's asking you something about
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advice solicited from the Attorney General's office, whether it be from Mr. Knoff or on behalf of the Department, we'll assert the privilege and instruct the witness not to answer. But outside of that, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Well, the questions were to the Attorney General's office, but they came to me and they were more just questions about what coverage and different things like that.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Staff coverage?
A. Yes.
Q. And Tom Knoff drafted those questions?
A. He and his staff drafted them.
Q. And do you know what the questions were for?

Were they looking for legal advice or what was that about?
A. I don't know if they were -- yes, I do believe that they were asking for legal advice.
Q. Anything else that you reviewed in that category of "old stuff'?
A. No, not really.
Q. Was that no, not at all, or there might have been something else or --
A. No, not at all.
Q. Did you speak with anyone other than your attorney to prepare for today's deposition?
A. Well, I've spoken with Human Resources, but other than that, the attorney.
Q. Who did you speak with there?
A. Julie Cloud.
Q. And when did you two talk?
A. Well, the last time we talked was this morning because she was ill. She called me to tell me that she was ill and wouldn't be coming in today.
Q. Sorry to hear that. Did you talk about her deposition?
A. I asked her how it went and she said that she's glad it was over.
Q. Most people usually are. Did you discuss any of the testimony that she offered?
A. She questioned whether or not she had answered the questions right.
Q. Any particular questions?
A. She talked about -- you know, I can't
remember. No, because she was so sick, I just wanted
her to get off the phone because she sounded so horrible.
Q. Have you spoken with Betty Grimm?
A. I spoke --

MR. COLLAER: To the extent you spoke with her outside the presence of your attorneys, then go ahead.

Otherwise, we'll assert the privilege and don't answer.
THE WITNESS: I spoke with her the day of her deposition.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) But not since, other than --
A. No. No, I have not spoken with her. She left me a voicemail that said that she was -- she would be thinking of me on Monday, but I didn't call her back.
Q. All right. And before her deposition had you spoken with her about her deposition?
A. I called her and told her that I would be here and to support her.
Q. Did you talk about anything that she might testify about?
A. No.
Q. Did you speak with anyone else other than Julie Cloud or Betty Grimm?
A. No.
Q. Have you spoken with Laura Roters since her deposition?
A. No.
(Mr. de Knijf entered the deposition.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Did you review any responses to discovery in preparation for today's deposition?
A. No, I did not. You know, I take that back, Andrew. I did review some of the e-mails. Is that what

Page 9 you're talking about?
Q. It could be if you're referring to documents that might have been produced by the Department or by the Plaintiffs.
A. Yeah. And, you know, I did that a while ago, but I did look at some of those.
Q. Do you remember what you looked at?
A. No, I can't tell you exactly what I looked at.
Q. Any general topics that you might be able to recall of those e-mails?
A. Well, the one e-mail that talked about Rhonda being, you know, being -- showing up to work on time, I remember reviewing that e-mail.
Q. Do you remember who that was from?
A. I believe it was from Julie Cloud.
Q. All right. At some point did you review document requests that were produced by the Plaintiffs -- or propounded by the Plaintiffs to the Department and to you and Ms. Grimm?
A. Did I review the document requests?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And did you yourself gather documents that might have been responsive to that or did someone else?
A. Yes, I did.
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Q. Did IT or anybody else handle any part of
those responses as far as you know?
A. Yes.
Q. And who did that in IT?
A. Mike Seifrit is what I believe. I just know
IT pulled a lot of the documents.
Q. What kinds of documents were they responsible
for finding?
A. It's my belief they had pulled e-mails that
you requested from the time the lawsuit was filed until
present.
Q. All right. Anything else that they might have
looked for as far as you know?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Did you also review interrogatories that had
been propounded by the Plaintiffs?
A. I don't even know what that means.
Q. A question basically, a question about a
particular topic. I can show you the document. We'll
get to that in a little while, but this would have been
along with the Plaintiffs' request for production of
documents and another request called requests for
admissions.
A. I don't know if I did or not because I don't
know what those would have been, so -- Page 11
Q. Or a written discovery? Would that ring a bell?
A. Would I have reviewed written discovery?
Q. Right.
A. I don't -- I don't recall that I have, but --
Q. Okay, we'll look at --
A. But that doesn't --
Q. I'm sorry, I'm breaking the rules by
interrupting you. That's one other thing I should have told you at the beginning is that if you can let me finish my question and then give your response, and we'll avoid talking over each other like I just did so that the Court Reporter doesn't get angry with us both, although I'm the one who should really know better.

A little bit about your background. Are you from Idaho or somewhere else?
A. I am from Idaho.
Q. Whereabouts?
A. I grew up in Ashton, Idaho, on a potato farm, pure Idahoan.
Q. I guess. Where is Ashton, by the way? I'm not familiar with that.
A. It's close to -- it's in the cusp of southeastern Idaho. It's close to the Washington, Montana border up by Yellowstone Park and Jackson Hole,

Wyoming.
Q. Did you go to high school out in that area?
A. I went to high school in Ashton until my
senior year and I graduated from Borah.
Q. All right.
A. Here in Boise.
Q. All right. And at some point did you go to college?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you go to college?
A. I started at Boise State. I went to the University of Utah and Utah State as well, graduated from Boise State.
Q. All right. And when was it you started at Boise State?
A. The fall of ' 74 .
Q. And did you have a particular major when you started?
A. Art.
Q. And how long were you there?
A. I was there for two years, took a year off to save money to go out of state, which is when I went to Utah State, and then came back and finished at Boise State.
Q. All right. So --
A. '79 is when I graduated.
Q. '79? Okay. Why did you go to Utah? I mean, why did you go to Utah State?
A. I wanted the opportunity to -- I couldn't afford to go -- to live outside of, but I wanted the opportunity, so I just sat out a year. And that was a good college for me in art and so I decided that's what I would do and took out a year, you know, saved money and came back.
Q. Sure. Okay. Did you work during that year?
A. While I was at Utah State?
Q. The year --
A. The year that I took off, yes. Yes, I did.
Q. What kind of work did you do?
A. My family owns Hillcrest Floral. So, I worked full time at the flower shop.
Q. Did you have a particular career goal as an art major?
A. Well, at that point I thought that I would do, be an illustrator. And Utah State had a good -- they had a really good program because they would have art directors from Los Angeles do the assignments and then come up and critique them.
Q. All right. You wouldn't have happened to have known a guy named Clint Taylor; would you?
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A. No.
Q. He's a cousin. He draws Spider Man. So, I'm pretty sure he went through Utah State.

And what did you end up graduating with?
A. Sociology. I took a sociology class and fell in love with juvenile delinquency and so I ended up getting my degree in sociology.
Q. Is that a B.S. or a B.A.?
A. It's a B.A. Of course, with all of the art background it was --
Q. Right. And what did you do next after you graduated?
A. After I graduated I worked for the -- well, I still worked in the flower shop because I worked throughout my -- when I was at Boise State I always worked at the flower shop. And then when I graduated I started -- I was a research analyst for the Capital For a Day project, which was just providing the Governor and all of his staff with research about the communities that he was going into.
Q. All right.
A. Until ' 81 , and then I started doing consulting work in the juvenile justice field.
Q. So, that was 1979 to 1981 ?
A. 1980 to 1981 is when I did the Capital For a
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Day.
Q. And what was Capital For a Day?
A. The Govemor would go to a county or go to a community and claim it Capital For a Day. He would start in the moming with breakfast and then meet with folks all throughout the day to just talk about what their issues were and concems.
Q. And what Govemor was that?
A. Evans.
Q. How did you get that job?
A. I applied for it.
Q. What kind of research did you do?
A. Things like what the main economy of a county was and what the concems were over the last year, what some of the concems the county had over issues that possibly the Govemor could deal with.
Q. Sort of advance briefing work for the Govemor?
A. Yes.
Q. So, he talks about potatoes in potato counties and timber in timber counties?
A. Right, what the issues of the senior citizens were, different things like that.
Q. And why did you leave that job?
A. I left that job because my supervisor said
some negative things about me and I didn't think that it was appropriate for me to continue with it, so I left it. And when I told the Govemor I had to leave -- I didn't tell him why I was leaving, I just said that I was leaving and going back to the flower shop. And it came out a couple of months later that that's actually -- that actually, that supervisor was saying negative things about other people too.

So, then, they -- because my interest was in juvenile justice anyway, then they allowed me to start doing some consulting work with compliance monitoring, things like that.
Q. What were the negative sorts of things that the supervisor was saying?
A. You know, I -- I can't really remember because I just put it all out of my mind. But then the director of the Department of Health and Welfare came back later and said, "You know, he was saying some negative things about me too. I realize now that you were telling the truth."
Q. Just sort of hypercritical things?
A. Made-up things. You know, like I said, I really can't remember because I just blocked all of that, but just things that when I -- what I do remember is telling the Governor that, "It's in my best interest
and your best interest for me to leave." So, that's what I did.
Q. That's too bad.
A. And then when I was doing the consulting work with the -- to do compliance monitoring, looking at jails and different things that were holding kids, I was also working in a residential treatment facility that had a teenage girl in it. And then I also ran the -during that time I quit working for them when the Alcoholism Council needed someone to be the executive director. So, I became the executive director of the Alcoholism Council because they were doing a lot of stuff for kids and really pushing prevention of kids using drugs and alcohol, so --
Q. Stepping back to when you left the Capital For a Day program, where did you start working next? Was that Health and Welfare?
A. No, I've never worked for Health and Welfare.
Q. I'm sorry, I must have misunderstood.
A. No, I worked back at the flower shop.
Q. Okay. And then you mentioned consulting.
A. Consulting with -- at that time the funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was through the Govemor's office, and so I did the compliance monitoring for that through the
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Govermor's office.
Q. And how did that opportunity come about?
A. Because their compliance monitor -- well, it came about because their compliance monitor didn't want to go on the roads in November because the roads were bad. So, they asked me if I wanted to and I said,
"Sure, I grew up in snow." So, I was out doing
compliance monitoring in between Thanksgiving and
Christmas because it had to be in by December 31.
Q. And that opportunity came your way because you were already acquainted with people in the Governor's office; is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. So, did that make you a state employee or --
A. No, I was just a consultant.
Q. All right. Paid as an independent contractor?
A. Mm-hmm. Yes. I'm sorry. So, at that time I
was a consultant doing compliance monitoring and I was
an employee of the Alcoholism Council and doing some other consulting on the side with a group called Daley \& Associates.
Q. And the Alcoholism Council, is that a state agency?
A. No, it was a private nonprofit.
Q. And what was your role there?
A. Executive director.
Q. In your consultant role did you have a
business entity or anything like that or was it just you?
A. Well, it rolled into Daley \& Associates after a bit, but at first it was just me.
Q. And then what did Daley \& Associates do?
A. We did things like work with the Idaho

Prosecuting Attomey's Association to plan their meetings and audit jails and different things like that for them.
Q. If you could describe the business, how would you describe it?
A. It was three or four women, depending upon the year, with Karen Daley was the principal in it. And as she had work that needed to be done, she would contact us to come in and help her with the work that she had on her plate. And depending upon who had time or, you know, whatever, we would just help her with that.
Q. All right. And what was her background as far as you recall?
A. She -- prior to that she was a presentence investigator.
Q. And what was it that you did there specifically?
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A. Well, we rolled the compliance monitoring into Daley \& Associates where I would monitor jails for compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, look at the number of kids that were securely held in jails and, you know, go around the state and look at that.
Q. All right. And by "jails," was this prior to the system of detention centers and juvenile corrections centers?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Was there any kind of an organized system as to how jails were established in the juvenile context at that time, like a legal structure from the legislature or anything like that?
A. The legal structure was that we were participating in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, which meant that juveniles could not be securely detained in detention facilities if they were just arrested for status offenses or if they were in jails. Because at that time it was just if they were in jails they had to be sight and sound separated from adults.
Q. And what time frame are we at at this point when you're working for Daley \& Associates?
A. Probably 1982. I don't know exactly when that
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was because there was a mixture in there, but through 1986.
Q. And what did you do next?
A. In 1986 I was offered the job to be the -what it was called is the juvenile justice specialist to manage the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act funds.
Q. And who offered you that position?
A. Govemor Andrus.
Q. And how was it that that opportunity came to you?
A. Because I had already been working with them. I had already done a lot of the consulting and I had started -- in 1983 we developed regional councils so that we had councils in all seven of the regions, Department of Health and Welfare regions at that time. We went with Health and Welfare regions. And I helped develop those and then I helped monitor all of the grants that came through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funds.
Q. Is it correct to say that at this point in time, 1986, the Department of Health and Welfare was still operating the juvenile justice system in Idaho?
A. They were -- yes. Not the part that I was part of, but yes, they were operating the facilities.
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Well, St. Anthony was the only facility.
Q. All right. And how long did you do that, the juvenile justice specialist, was it?
A. I did that until I applied for the same position when the Juvenile Corrections Act was created in 1995.
Q. So, 1986 to 1995 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it correct to say that the Juvenile Corrections Act established the Department of Juvenile Corrections as a separate entity?
A. Yes, it did. And what we wanted was, when the Juvenile Corrections Act was created we wanted one system for kids in the state. So, prior to that time we had the Office for Children that was operating. I was the JJ specialist under the Office for Children and we had juvenile justice in the Department of Health and Welfare. And it was important that we have one entity that really dealt with juvenile justice in the state. So, the Office for Children was abolished in an executive order and the funding from the federal government was moved over to the Department of Juvenile Corrections.
Q. And when you say "we" wanted that sort of thing to happen, who are you talking about?
A. All of the people that wanted the juvenile justice system changed for the betterment of kids.
Q. All right.
A. So, all of the people that testified to the
legislature, the people that helped write the Juvenile
Corrections Act, and all of the folks that worked toward changing the system.
Q. All right. And did you testify?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you mean you testified in the legislature?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you help draft the Juvenile Corrections Act?
A. I provided input into the Juvenile Corrections Act. The person that drafted it was a consultant that the legislators hired. His name was Jeff Nolan.
Q. And what was the input that you provided?
A. Well -- boy, there's -- part of the input was to really base it on the balance and restorative justice model, which is a model that talks about holding kids accountable but also giving them the competencies and providing community protection. We actually worked to help Mr. Nolan understand that whole concept. And the Juvenile Corrections Act is based on the balanced approach model.

I also testified that we needed an information system, that to me if we were going to hold the kids accountable we also had to hold the system accountable and we could only do that if we had a statewide information system. And I testified about the importance of the partnership with the communities and the state entity that was working with the kids.
Q. Is there any other model other than the balance and restorative justice model or is that sort of a new way of thinking about it?
A. I'm sure there is. You know, a lot of states have adopted that model.
Q. Is that set out somewhere in an academic paper or position papers?
A. There is a lot of research on it, yes.
Q. All right.
A. At that point in the mid ' 80 's there was the national juvenile -- the first joumal article was, the national juvenile and family court judges wrote an article on it and then it just evolved from there. But it wasn't just me that talked about the balance and approach model. There were judges that talked about it and legislators had researched it too, so please don't think that it was just me that pushed that model.
Q. All right. And the information system that
you testified about, did that tum into what's known as IJOS or something else?
A. IJOS. Yes, it was IJOS.
Q. And what does IJOS stand for?
A. Idaho Juvenile Offender System.
Q. And who administers that system?
A. Well, it's our IT department, but Mike Seifrit is in charge of that department.
Q. And what kind of information is recorded in IJOS?
A. Case management, movement of the kids, pretty much, you know, the -- it's based actually, if you look at the system there's a community protection, accountability, and competency development system within IJOS, but it's our system. The more the system evolves the stronger the system becomes and the more information is put in it.
Q. Do the courts access that system, the juvenile courts, or are reports generated for the courts from that system?
A. You know, I don't know the answer to that.
Q. And so, that takes us up to -- I think we left offat 1995 and you said you reapplied; is that right?
A. Yes. In the meantime I did in there, I did get my Master's degree in Counseling. So, I actually
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graduated from the College of Idaho in '93 with my
Master's in Counseling, so as far as the educational background.
Q. And what kind of degree was that?
A. A Master's of Education, community counseling emphasis.
Q. And did you become licensed as a counselor?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that license?
A. Licensed professional counselor.
Q. And have you kept that current?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. So, you had indicated earlier that you had reapplied?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you reapplied for the same position you were already holding?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And was everybody required to go through the reapplication process?
A. Only -- well, I don't -- yes, because it was a new department. So, if we -- anybody that wanted a new position in the Department had to apply.
Q. All right. And were you rehired for the same position?
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A. The title changed to socioeconomic planner. Don't ask me how it got to that title. But since I was doing the statewide plan, I think they determined that that was the best -- that was the best position that it fit into.
Q. And who was your supervisor when you were rehired?
A. At first my supervisor was the Director, who was Michael Johnson.
Q. And that changed at some point?
A. And that changed to the administrative services administrator, our chief fiscal officer, Tony Meatte.
Q. And when did that change happen in supervisors?
A. We kind of restructured. I can't remember. By that point Brent Reinke was the Director and I can't -- I can't remember exactly what year that was.
Q. That's all right. And how long did you hold that position, socioeconomic planner?
A. I think we -- I don't know. It changed a couple of times. And then I think I became a grants contracts officer or something like that. It evolved. And I actually held that position until I became the COPS administrator, which was in -- Larry was the

Director. So, it would have been probably 2004, 2005.
Q. And Larry Callicutt?
A. Yes. Or 2006 maybe. Somewhere around there is when I became the COPS administrator.
Q. And in your role as the grants and programs manager, what did you do?
A. I was responsible for the federal funds, writing the annual grant applications, statewide plans, working with counties to -- you know, because most of our funds were passed through to local units of government or counties, private nonprofits.
Q. And did you interface with the OJJDP in that role?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

MR. COLLAER: You have to answer audibly.
THE WITNESS: Yes, those were the funds that we were administering.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) So, it was like federal block grants and things like that or something else?
A. When I started there was just the formula grant, which was the -- it's called Title 2. Then there were challenge grants that challenged us to improve the juvenile justice systems. And we used a lot of that money -- we used that money to start after-care programs. We used that money to develop our first risk
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assessment, the Idaho risk assessment instrument. And then the next funding was Title 5 funding, which was prevention. It was comprehensive prevention funding so that it would allow communities to develop a comprehensive plan to prevent kids from coming into the juvenile justice system.

And then the federal act was ready to be reauthorized, this is '97, '98, and it couldn't get reauthorized for a variety of reasons. It's a difficult act to get reauthorized. And so, the appropriations committee funded some money called the juvenile accountability block grant. There wasn't authorizing language but there was funding. It was a big pot of money, $\$ 2.1$ million when it started. It's down to -- I think the last time I looked it's $\$ 300,000$ or something like that.

That \$2.I million we started getting I think in '97, '98. The requirements on that were there was an allocation. And so, most of that money went out to local units of govemment. We could keep -- the way the language worked is if in the population, if a county -if a county was to receive less than $\$ 10,000$, then we could keep it at the state and do something at the state with that funding. If it was more than $\$ 10,000$, the county or a city, depending upon their population. So,
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in the days when we were getting $\$ 2.1$ million, there were several cities that received funding and all of the counties. But as the money started dwindling, we kept giving it to the counties.

So, it allowed us to keep 5 percent for administrative purposes and then we could keep the other money that was less than $\$ 10,000$. But we didn't -because of the structure of our system, it's really important that counties get as much money as they can to keep as many kids in the community as possible. So, we gave most of that money, we passed most of that money through to -- you know, we still used the allocation, the population allocation. When it got down to $\$ 7,500$, we still gave all counties $\$ 7,500$.

And so, we've tried to use that money as much as we can to pass it through. And I believe that now all -- most all of it has passed through. We keep, you know, the 5 percent. It's an interesting appropriation. Because of all of the federal funds, this is the one that you actually get the money up front. And so, we were able to use the interest, which $\$ 2.1$ million can create a lot of interest. And so, we were able to use that interest for the juvenile justice system too.

We at first used that funding to help develop regional children's mental health councils. The first
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year that's what we used the money for. They did not provide good outcome information with that. And so, the second year we pulled that money in-house and used that, have used that from then on to fund POST, the police officers -- or Peace Officers Standards and Training.

And that has been what we've used to fund both the probation officers and also the detention officers to do their training. And now our direct care staff are also POST certified. That's how we got that whole thing started was through that JAIBG money and the interest that we had, Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant funds. But as far as a block grant, that's the block grant funding.
Q. What was the federal act that you referred to?
A. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.
Q. And then the Title 2 grants, what were --
A. That's the formula. Those were the formula grants through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.
Q. What do they mean by "formula grants"?
A. What that means is that each state that chooses to participate in the act agrees to look at the number of kids that are securely detained in detention facilities for status offenses and also sight and sound
separation -- at the first, sight and sound separation, eventually removal of kids from adult jails. But when it first started it had the two requirements and today there are four requirements.

But the formula grant is based on population of the state. And so, what each state -- there's an allocation that goes out and the state writes a three-year plan based on what the crime analysis says and, you know, what your juvenile justice needs are. But the allocation is determined prior to -- we've always been a minimum state. So, we get the minimum amount.
Q. And I understand that you moved on to become a COPS administrator?
A. Mm-hmm. Yes.
Q. Sorry. It's hard, I know. What was your role there?
A. At that point, then, I administered the grants, that section, and then also the POST and the district liaisons. There's a district liaison in all of our districts that works the liaison between the counties and the state. And quality improvement.
Q. What did COPS stand for?
A. Community Operations and Program Services.
Q. And how long did you do that job?
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A. Until I became the Director.
Q. And what year was it that you left? Was that 2009?
A. Yes, it is. It was 2009.
Q. So, then, you were COPS administrator from what year to what year?
A. Probably 2007 to 2009.
Q. And how did the opportunity to become the Director arise?
A. Director Callicutt was retiring. And so, there were several of us that applied.
Q. Do you know who else applied?
A. Yes, I do. Well, I don't know all of the people that applied, but I know that Kevin Bematz applied and Bill Lasley applied and Steve Jett, who runs the detention facility in Canyon County.
Q. Is it Steve Lasley; is that right?
A. Bill Lasley, Steve Jett.
Q. Sorry. Okay. And was this an appointment process or was it a -- how did you go about applying for the job?
A. Yes, it's an appointment process because it's -- my boss is the Govemor.
Q. All right. And did you interview with him?
A. Yes, I did. I interviewed with his director
of the Department of Administration first. I think he narrowed it down and then I interviewed with the Govemor.
Q. And who was that Department of Administration director?
A. Michael Gwartney.
Q. And we're talking about Govemor Otter; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know why Director Callicutt retired?
A. His wife was having some health problems and he had had some health problems.
Q. As COPS administrator, who did you report to within the Department?
A. Director Callicutt.
Q. Apart from the Master's in Counseling that you indicated that you have and your LPC, is it, licensed professional counselor?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any other sort of certifications or anything like that?
A. I was a certified alcohol drug counselor. I did let that certification lapse. No other certifications.
Q. And when was it that you were certified for that?
A. The early ' 80 's.
Q. Are you POST or AUF certified?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Any other kinds of trainings or certifications like that within the context of Juvenile Corrections?
A. I go to trainings on a regular basis, but no certifications.
Q. So, you might attend like AUF trainings, for example?
A. I have attended an AUF training, but I am far from certified.
Q. I understand you're also affiliated with the CJCA, Council For Juvenile Corrections Administrators?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And when did you first begin your association there?
A. Director Callicutt, when I was appointed the director, he told me that I needed to get in contact with those folks, gave me some names of the people that had been helpful to him as far as directors. And they have a pretty good network. They had contacted me within I think a couple of weeks, two or three weeks.
Q. And was Director Callicutt part of that group?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. And what was your role in the group?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Were you just a member of the group or what did you do?
A. Yes, I was a member of the group. Then I became the regional rep for the westem region after about a year, I think.
Q. And did you join when you became the Director; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And how long did you serve as the regional representative?
A. You know, it might have been a couple of years into it, but then -- I served as the regional rep and then I became the secretary of the board. So, I think I was the regional rep for maybe a year and then I became the secretary of the board.
Q. And do you still hold that position?
A. No, I'm the vice president now.
Q. Vice president for anything in particular or --
A. Just vice president of CJCA.
Q. And what are your duties as the vice president?
A. We have regular executive board meetings. If the president is not available, then I run the meeting.
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That's never happened, but -- we review -- we did a sustainability -- we contracted with a consultant to do a sustainability plan and the executive board members did a lot of work to figure out what our next steps were for for CJCA.
Q. What do you mean by "sustainability plan"?
A. Because CJCA is a private nonprofit and just figuring out what we can do to keep the association running. Grants, you know, different things like that.
Q. Do you know what IRS code section it's organized under, like a 501 (c)(3) versus something else?
A. I think it's 501 (c)(3), but that's a guess, Andrew.
Q. That's all right, just whatever you think. I won't hold you to that. What does CJCA do?
A. What is CJCA to me?
Q. What does CJCA do?
A. CJCA is really a -- provides an opportunity for directors to get together and talk about what's the best -- the best way for us to improve conditions of confinement for kids and, you know, how to deal with the everyday in's and out's of being a director of a statewide department. It's a support system.
Q. And does that group have an affiliation with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

## Prevention?

A. They do get some grants. That's part of the problem with the sustainability. Right now they are a partner with a grant that's called the National Youth in Custody grant and they're partners with the National Juvenile Detention Group. But we just found out that that group, the other group won the second year of that. So, when this one -- I think we will get a no-cost extension on this grant and then we will not have any funds from OJJDP, I don't believe.
Q. What's the other group? The National --
A. It's the National Partnership For Juvenile Services, NPJS.
Q. And is that sort of an alternative
organization to the CJCA or do they do the same sorts of things?
A. It's primarily for detention administrators. It's more of -- there's the directors of state agencies and then there's the directors of all of the detention facilities. And the NPJS is an organization that works a lot with the detention facilities.
Q. As far as you know, do they work with detention facilities here in Idaho?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that detention facilities
are for temporary holding of juveniles?
A. Yes.
Q. Broadly speaking?
A. Broadly speaking.
Q. And are those as far as you know governed by the Juvenile Corrections Act?
A. Yes.
Q. And also by IDAPA?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that the IDAPA $5-$ is it 5.01
something, that series?
A. I can't tell you the exact series. There is the IDAPA rules for contract providers, there's the IDAPA rules for detention facilities, and there are also IDAPA rules for probation officers.
Q. And I understand that, and correct me if I'm wrong, is it CJCA that developed the Performance-based Standards?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And tell me about those. What are those and what are they for?
A. They're really to improve conditions of confinement in facilities. They can be -- the Performance-based Standards can be for correctional institutions, they can also be for detention facilities. sent back. We have a coach that comes out and talks with our facilities, discusses what needs to be done to develop performance improvement plans or facility improvement plans, FIPs, to improve our conditions of confinement.
Q. So, April and October are the reporting periods?
A. Yes.
Q. And then what happens with the data that is submitted? That goes back to CJCA; is that right?
A. No, it goes to Performance-based Standards. They're separate organizations.
Q. Okay.
A. So, it goes back to PbS .
Q. All right.
A. And PbS then, it's their data bank. They compile the information and send back the reports to our -- for us. You know, we have a PbS coordinator and then we have PbS coordinators in each of -- we have a statewide PbS coordinator and a PbS coordinator in all three of our facilities.
Q. And who is PbS ? Is this another nonprofit or something like that?
A. I -- yes. I don't know if they're nonprofit or not, but they are -- it's an agency. It's a Performance-based Standards group.
Q. A private group as far as you know?
A. Yes, they used to be a part of CJCA, but they split before I became really involved in CJCA.
Q. As far as you know, do they have an affiliation with OJJDP?
A. OJJDP is the organization that funded the first part of -- I mean, they're the ones that started -- provided the funding to start PbS . I do know that.
Q. Do you know if they're still involved with them?
A. No, it's self-sustaining.
Q. What kinds of data are reported at those reporting periods in April and October?
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A. Safety and security data, health, education.

There's reporting on reintegration information now and, just starting, family engagement information.
Q. And how is the data collected?
A. Staff put the input in, the incident reports, all of that stuff is submitted to PbS .
Q. So, is it fair to say that someone like the PbS coordinator reviews the IJOS data, incident reports, that sort of thing, compiles the appropriate data, and passes that along?
A. Puts it in -- you know, that's my understanding. As far as actually walking through how that's done, I've never sat down with them and saw from the beginning to the end because it's been -- it's been running pretty smoothly. So, you know, I haven't had the need to see if there's something that's not working.
Q. How was it that that -- was that a system that was in place when you became the Director?
A. Yes.
Q. And who trains the PbS coordinators to do their jobs?
A. The statewide PbS coordinator trains them. The statewide PbS coordinator trains them, and the statewide PbS coordinator goes to training back with the national PbS folks. And then we have, as I mentioned
earlier, we have a coach that comes out to work with staff from PbS .
Q. And who is the statewide coordinator now?
A. The statewide coordinator now is Jessica

Moncada.
Q. M-o-n-c-a-d-a?
A. Yes, 1 believe so. I'm pretty sure that's how you spell her last name.
Q. And has she been the PbS coordinator throughout your tenure as Director?
A. No, she has not. Prior to her it was Deborah Day.
Q. And how long did Ms. Day do that?
A. Ms. Day became the PbS coordinator -- our first PbS coordinator was Frank Riley and Frank was the -- he was the PbS coordinator and then he became the COPS administrator. When he became the COPS administrator he continued with PbS coordination for a bit, and then Deborah Day applied for and got that position.
Q. Is she still with the Department?
A. No, she's retired.
Q. And who does the statewide PbS coordinator report to?
A. The quality improvement director.
A. Yes. know?
A. The data. basis. DCTAT system? into the DCTAT.
Q. And who is that now?
A. Now that is Monty Prow, P-r-o-w.
Q. And that's who Ms. Moncada reports to?
Q. Was that who Ms. Day reported to?
A. No, Ms. Day reported to Frank Riley.
Q. All right. And when you said that Frank Riley was "our first PBS coordinator," do you mean the Deparment's first or --
A. Yes. When the Department adopted the PbS standards, he was the first PbS coordinator.
Q. All right. And who did he report to, if you
A. Back at the beginning he reported to Brent Reinke, our Director.

Q . After the PbS data is reported in and reports come back or -- did I understand you to say it was analysis or audits or what comes back from PbS ?
Q. And is that in a report form or an audit or --
A. It's in a report form. You can -- people that are responsible for it can go in and look at all of the standards and all of the reports. And then usually the critical ones, especially the ones that are related to the facility improvement plans, the PbS coordinator
pulls together that data.
We've changed that a little bit in that I've asked the PbS coordinator to report quarterly to the leadership team, whether it's safety and security or health or -- you know, something that would be of interest to all of the leadership team on a regular
Q. And how is the information then used for -- is it just an internal process to determine what should be done next in terms of programs or facilities?
A. Pretty much that's what it's used for. It's a conditions of confinement, to improve the conditions of confinement in each of the facilities.

Q . Is the data that's collected for PbS the same data that gets reported to -- you're familiar with the
A. Yes, I am familiar with that. No, those two don't relate to each other at all.
Q. What kind of data goes into a DCTAT report?
A. That's the Data Collection Technical

Assistance and Training, and that is the OJJDP funds.
So, those grants that we talked about earlier, the formula, enforcing underage drinking, Title 5, the prevention funds, all of that information is plugged
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Q. And who is responsible for that?
A. The person that inputs that data is Lisa

Stoner.
Q. All right.

MR. COLLAER: Counsel, it's been over an hour.
Is this an appropriate place to break?
MR. SCHOPPE: Sure, that's okay.
(Recess held.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Back on the record. I'm not sure if you told me before. Who is it that's responsible for reporting data through the DCTAT system?
A. Lisa Stoner.
Q. That's right. I'm sorry, I couldn't find her name written down. And do you call it "Dictat" or anything like that? That's what I would do. Something like "Dictator" or something like that?
A. No, DCTAT is what they usually say when they're reporting it.
Q. Thank you. With respect to PbS data or reports, are those used in any way to obtain funding from either the state or federal government?
A. No.
Q. And is it fair to say that DCTAT data is used to obtain funding from the federal government?
A. I wouldn't necessarily say that. That is used
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to report how the funding is used, not necessarily to obtain funding. So, for instance, if a grant is saying that they're going to use the money to provide services to kids, how many kids were served?

Q . With respect to PbS data, is that used in the same way, to report to the federal or state government how funds are being used?
A. No.
Q. Is PbS data used to obtain funding of any kind from any source?
A. No.
Q. Does that include for staff positions or facility improvements or anything like that?
A. It's used to help us with conditions of confinement. We report on what the data says to -- you know, we use it in our reports to the legislature, but it's not as a leverage, it's to just report what the numbers say.
Q. Is that reported to the federal government in any way?
A. No.
Q. With respect to the DCTAT data, what sorts of things are reported through that system?
A. Like I said earlier, it's number of kids getting services, number of meetings being held,
different things like that, depending upon the funding stream. Because there are so many different funding streams, the data that's for each of those funding streams really relates to the funding stream.
Q. What kind of funding streams are there?
A. So, for instance, the enforcing underage drinking laws. So, what that is is to help communities enforce the underage drinking laws to reduce kids from drinking. Part of that money is used for law enforcement to -- so, part of it is used for overtime so that if they bust a kegger or something like that, you know, how many hours of overtime was used?

If it's the prevention money, then it's
whatever the -- so, for now, right now the prevention dollars are going to Kamiah, which is a community up north, if you don't know where Kamiah is. So, it's what are they doing with that money up there?
Q. Do the same sorts of things that are in the IJOS system, like incident reports, things like that, factor into DCTAT data?
A. No, DCTAT is primarily community based. It's for programs that we're funding out in the community.
Q. Since you were appointed as Director of the Department, have you made any changes in the criteria, what sorts of things make it into the PbS data set that
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gets reported?
A. That's all determined. I don't have any say over that.
Q. All right.
A. That's all part of the Performance-based Standards from the PbS nationally.
Q. All right. Again, since you took over as Director, have you made any changes in the way that suicide precaution levels are reported or recorded?
A. We have been working on getting a statewide suicide policy and procedure so that all three facilities are working under the same suicide policy and procedure. That's the change, that we just made sure that everyone is working with the same policy and procedure.
Q. Is there a particular procedure that you're adopting, like one facility's is better than another's or anything like that?
A. We combined all three to come up with the best.
Q. And when was that?
A. When was that? I think it's finally been adopted this last year. It took a bit to get them all combined, but I can't tell you exactly.
Q. Again, since you took over as Director, have
there been any changes made to the way in which recidivism is measured?
A. No.
Q. Is there a particular standard that's been in place since before you came onboard?
A. Since before I came on, the standard is recidivism is a new conviction of a crime within a year.
Q. Is that a new conviction of any crime or a different crime?
A. A new conviction of a new crime.
Q. Okay.
A. So, not a status offense, not a probation violation, but a new crime.
Q. How about a new conviction for the same crime that the juvenile might have been in for the first time around?
A. If they committed the same crime again, then that would be a new crime. So, if they committed a burglary -- if they burglarized a house and they were out and then when they were out in the community they burglarized another house, then yes, that would be -you know, they recidivated.
Q. And that gets recorded in IJOS; is that right?
A. That's recorded in our recidivism data. So, if the county is part of IJOS, then possibly, but
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it's -- you know, there's some counties that aren't part of IJOS. And then if the kid turns 18 and he commits a crime, then he's part of the adult system. Then it still goes into our system where we're recording it. We're recording it on the Director's Dashboard.
Q. Are you aware of any instance in which it might be appropriate to record a suicide prevention level, a suicide precaution level of $I, 2$, or 3 at a lower level than -- I'm sorry, this is turning out to be a terrible question. So, let me start over.

Are you familiar with the suicide precaution system?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just briefly describe that forme?
A. There are three different levels of suicides.

Level I is just observation -- I mean regular observations. 2 is observations with checks every ten minutes, and then -- not every ten minutes but, you know, sporadically within ten minutes. And then level 3 is eyes on.
Q. All right. And who is it that makes the determination as to what precaution level might be appropriate for any given juvenile?
A. The suicide evaluator.
Q. Are you aware of any reason why a level like

1,2 , or 3 might be assigned or recorded, rather, in a report when in fact a higher level might be called for?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form, assumes facts not in evidence, and calls for speculation.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Would you like me to clarify it a little more?
A. Yes, please.
Q. For example, if it's determined that a juvenile requires eyes on top level supervision, is there any reason why that would be recorded as a mid level or lower level suicide precaution level on an incident report or something like that?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of whether that's ever happened?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Since you've been the Director, has there been any change made to the kinds of violent incidents involving juveniles that are required to be reported?
A. Would you rephrase that question.
Q. Sure. Since you've been the Director, have there been any changes made to the kinds of violent incidents involving juveniles that are required to be recorded in incident reports?
A. So, if I were to rephrase what you just asked me, I think what you're asking me is: Have I changed
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the way we report violent incidents in the system?
Q. Sure, we can start there.
A. No.
Q. Have you ever told anyone that more serious incidents like a code red incident should be recorded as a yellow or something like that?
A. No.
Q. Is that how incidents are graded, red, yellow?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there another level?
A. I just know of code red or code yellow.
Q. Are you aware of whether that has ever occurred in any given violent incident?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Have you had any legal training with respect to the laws and policies that govern the operations of the Department of Juvenile Corrections? For example, PREA, CRIPA training, Health and Welfare, anything like that?
A. Formal legal training? You know, every meeting I go to we talk about CRIPA, PREA, IDAPA rules. So, as far as formal legal training, no.
Q. All right. I don't mean like law school, I mean in the sense of a seminar or some sort of instructive course for employees in the Department.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me about those.
A. We all went through a PREA training.
Q. And when you say "we all," is that the whole department?
A. Every staff person is required to go through

PREA training.
Q. And when was that?
A. Within this last year.
Q. Is that an annual requirement?
A. I don't know if we determined that or not. We get PREA training quite a bit.
Q. Had you had a similar training prior to this year, this last year?
A. Well, we have been talking about PREA since it was -- since the act was initiated and now that the standards are there. So, there's been ongoing discussion and informal training.
Q. When you say "we," who do you mean?
A. Leadership, directors from other states, through the Idaho Association of County Juvenile Justice Administrators. So, ongoing.
Q. And when was it, as far as you know, that PREA was instituted?
A. The act was passed in 2003. The standards
were promulgated last year finally. We -- you know, so we've been working on it since then.
Q. All right. Prior to those standards being promulgated was there any other kind of set of standards or guidelines that was sort of in between? Anything you could refer to in determining whether something might be a PREA incident or anything like that?
A. Well, the standards are that there will not be sexual assault in facilities. So, you know, that's -whether it was considered a PREA incident or a sexual assault incident, you know, those are the standards.
Q. Are you aware of any sexual assaults between juveniles and staff that have taken place within any facility?
A. I am now. Julie McCormick.
Q. And what is it that you know about that?
A. I know that she admitted to having a sexual relationship with one of our juveniles.
Q. And how is it that you're aware of that?
A. I'm aware of it because she admitted to it and then there was an investigation done and -- there was an investigation done from the Nampa Police Department at the facility.
Q. To whom did she admit that to?
A. I believe she admitted it in court. I read
aboutit in the paper that she admitted to it.
Q. All right. Do you know if she admitted that to anyone within the Department?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. And the juvenile in question was CY ; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Had you ever heard of any other reports or even rumors of other sexual relationships or romantic relationships between staff and juveniles?
A. There was one up in Lewiston early on when the Department was -- when that facility was first built that I knew of.
Q. All right. Do you know if that involved Devin Keene Mercer?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you learn about that?
A. It was reported by the superintendent up there.
Q. Who was that?
A. I believe it was David Bash at the time.
Q. You said "early on." Do you know when that was?
A. It was right after that facility was built, so 2001 or 2002. It was right through there.
Q. All right. Do you know what happened after
that was reported?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if that was reported to the Department of Health and Welfare?
A. I don't know any more about that. I just know of that.
Q. Have you ever heard of a relationship between Francine Diaz and Bryce Larsen?
A. Yes, I did hear of that relationship.
Q. What did you hear about that?
A. When did I hear about it?
Q. What did you hear about it?
A. What did I hear about it? I heard that they were living together.
Q. And do you know when it was that you heard about that?
A. Well, when they were living together. It was -- I can't remember the year, but I was the Director when I heard about it.
Q. So, sometime after, was it August of 2009 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that you became Director?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you take any steps to investigate
that?
A. I looked into it. They were both adults and it -- there wasn't any -- there weren't any steps to take.
Q. Was there any concern that there might have been an inappropriate relationship while Bryce was still a juvenile?
A. I didn't hear of that.
Q. Who did you hear about it from?
A. Superintendent Grimm.
Q. What did she tell you about that?
A. She said that she had found out that they were living together. She talked with Legal about it and they were both adults, so it-- you know, it was -there was nothing inappropriate.
Q. Is there a policy about staff fraternizing with former juveniles?
A. Yes, but I don't know what the time frame is with that. I don't know.
Q. You're not sure when that policy was enacted?
A. No. Well, I don't know what -- no, I don't know when the policy was enacted and I don't know if there's a time frame of -- for how long.
Q. A waiting period kind of thing?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you know if anyone investigated whether
that policy might have applied to the relationship?
A. I don't.
Q. Do you know who, if anyone, in the Department
looked into the nature of the relationship other than
Betty Grimm and Legal?
A. Those would have been the people that would have been appropriate to do that.
Q. Are you aware of any disciplinary action of any kind taken against Ms. Diaz?
A. No.
Q. Did anyone express any concern that she might
have developed a similar sort of relationship with other juveniles?
A. Not tome.
Q. Did you have any concern about that?
A. No, I didn't really know Ms. Diaz.
Q. Did you ever hear about a relationship between Bryce Larsen and AH , a juvenile?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you hear about that?
A. I heard about that when Superintendent Grimm called me and told me that AH 's mother had said that he had been texting her.
Q. Did she say what the nature of those texts were?
A. No.
Q. All right. And was Ashley in the custody of the Department at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. And when was this?
A. I don't know the dates.
Q. Since you were the Director?
A. Since I was the Director, yes.
Q. And what, if anything, was done about that situation?
A. Bryce was disciplined.
Q. How so?
A. He no longer works for us.
Q. Was he terminated?
A. He was -- yes. I don't remember the exact, how that worked, but he -- I think he was given an ultimatum.
Q. All right. Was there any suspicion that the two had had a romantic or sexual relationship?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. As far as you know was Bryce a legal adult?
A. Yes.
Q. And as far as you know, was AH a minor?
A. I -- yes, I would assume she was.
Q. Was the incident or relationship reported to
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the Department of Health and Welfare?
A. I don't know the answer to that because I don't know if there was a relationship.
Q. And was the matter reported to law enforcement?
A. Again, I don't know the answer to that because I don't believe there was a sexual relationship.
Q. Do you know if anyone investigated -- made an investigation into whether there was a sexual relationship?
A. I can't remember.
Q. Who would have been responsible for investigating that?
A. If there was a belief, then we would have gone through the regular process of asking Legal to do an investigation -- or to begin an investigation.
Q. Did anyone have any reason to suspect that there might have been a sexual relationship?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for speculation.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) You can answer if you know.
A. I don't know.
Q. Were you concerned that there might have been one?
A. You know, at the time with the information
that I had, no, I wasn't.
Q. Do you know what the reporting requirements are for reporting child abuse and neglect to the Department of Health and Welfare?
A. Yes.
Q. What are those requirements?
A. That if you believe that there is harm to self or others or if, you know, someone is harming a child, that you have to report that. The person that is closest to the situation is required to report it.
Q. How about a suspicion or a concern? Is that something that should be reported?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for a legal conclusion.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) If you know.

MR. COLLAER: It's also inconsistent with the statute.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) As a matter of Department policy, should concerns or suspicions of those kinds of relationships be reported to the Department of Health and Welfare?

MR. COLLAER: Are you asking whether a policy to that effect exists?
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) As the Director, should that
be reported? Should staff report suspicions or concerns about that?
A. Staff should follow the statute, which is if
there is a belief that there is -- I mean, if there
needs to be an investigation, we'll do the
investigation.
Q. Did anyone ever tell you that they believed there had been a sexual relationship between Bryce and AH ?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if anyone ever told anyone else in the Department that they believed that there had been a sexual relationship?
A. No.
Q. Was there an incident involving a sexual relationship between Jennifer Watkins and a juvenile by the name of JR in 2012?
A. There was discussion that there was, but to my knowledge it wasn't validated.
Q. And when you say "discussion," what do you mean?
A. It had come to my attention that there was a report that there had been a sexual relation, but that it was not validated.
Q. And who brought that to your attention?
A. I can't remember.
Q. As far as you can recall, it would have been somebody at Lewiston, at the Lewiston facility?
A. No, I didn't hear about it until he was down in the Nampa facility.
Q. Do you recall how you heard about it?
A. What I heard was that he had reported it to I believe Gracie Reyna and that it -- and it didn't come to me until -- until afterwards. But I had heard that he had reported it to Gracie and then it came to me -it might have come to me through Legal. I just can't remember how it came to me.
Q. Did you look into the report and see what might have happened?
A. Yes, and it wasn't validated.
Q. And what do you mean by that?
A. What I heard was that it hadn't happened is what I had heard, and what the report -- what the information that I received.
Q. And what was the information that you received?
A. That there -- they had looked into it and that it -- you know, that it wasn't validated. As much as I can remember, it wasn't validated.
Q. Do you know who looked into it?
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A. No, I don't remember. I do remember that Rhonda called up there and talked about it to I think Nick Brillion. But I don't know as far as an appropriate investigation, I can't remember who looked into it that would be -- follow what our formal investigation is, I can't remember who did that.
Q. How did you hear about Rhonda talking to Nick Brillion?
A. I believe it was part of the whole piece with -- was there -- you know, I can't remember. I just remember that there was an issue with Gracie hearing it and Rhonda doing an investigation before it was reported.
Q. Did you ever find out that the incident had already been reported to staff at Lewiston before the report was made to Gracie?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever hear that Nick Brillion confirmed to Rhonda that it had already been reported and was under investigation there?
A. I can't remember that.
Q. Do those sorts of reports of those kinds of relationships typically go to you?
A. Eventually they will come to me, yes.
Q. As a matter of policy, should they?
A. I don't -- as a matter of policy? If there is a sexual relation with one of our staff and a kid, yes.
Q. Are you aware of allegations concerning an inappropriate sexual relationship involving a former juvenile by the name of Michael Curtis and former staff member Jackie -- I'm sorry, Katie McClain, I've got the name written down here wrong. I'm sorry, that's embarrassing, I can't remember. Anyway, involving a juvenile by the name of Michael Curtis?
A. I was not aware of that until this lawsuit.
Q. And is it fair to say you've seen the affidavit that Mr. Curtis submitted?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Do you know if any investigation has been conducted into that?
A. I don't know.
Q. Have you spoken with anyone from law enforcement about that?
A. Have I?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Jackie Raymond. That's the other name that I was struggling with. Sorry. How about Dr. Richard Pines, are you aware of any concerns having been raised by staff that Dr. Pines might be a threat to juveniles
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at the Department?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you know about that?
A. Well, what the paper said and the fact that he had one of his foster kids in our custody.
Q. Do you know if -- and you're talking about CM ?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if CM was Dr. Pines' foster child or a foster child of Aaron Pines, not Richard Pines?
A. I don't know the answer to that.
Q. And is it fair to say that Dr. Pines performed psychiatric services at Syringa House and Northwestern Children's House?
A. Northwest Children's Home and Syringa House?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And he treated Juvenile Corrections inmates there?
A. I'm not aware of that. We don't use Syringa House that often.
Q. When was it that you heard concerns, that concerns had been raised about Dr. Pines visiting the facility?
A. Either -- I can't remember when, but through Legal.
Q. All right. Did you ever discuss that with Betty Grimm?
A. We discussed -- what we discussed was that if Dr. Pines visited his foster child, that, you know, as with all, they're supervised visits. He's not alone in a room with them.
Q. All right. Are you aware of whether any staff reported inappropriate or strange conduct between Dr. Pines and CM ?
A. No, I'm not aware of that.
Q. Did anyone ever indicate that Dr . Pines was rubbing CM 's hands?
A. I was -- no.
Q. Was anything special done to monitor Dr. Pines in particular as opposed to any other kind of supervised visit?
A. I don't remember exactly what the sequence of events was, but when we found out that there were allegations against Dr. Pines, then we stopped the visits.
Q. Okay.
A. Is what I remember.
Q. All right.
A. As soon as we found out that there were allegations that were being filed.
Q. All right.
A. Is what I remember.
Q. And when you say "we," who do you mean?
A. Superintendent Grimm and I. I mean, she talked with me and we discussed it with Legal.
Q. Was that because you felt he was more of a threat to CM or other juveniles or why was it that the visits were stopped?
A. Because there were allegations.
Q. And you felt that was sufficient to warrant prohibiting him from visiting?
A. You know, I'll tell you that's what I remember is what we did.
Q. Whatever you remember. Do you know if Dr. Pines came into contact with any other juveniles during visits?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. With respect to Julie McCormick that you started talking about earlier, prior to the -- well, let me ask you this: Do you remember when it was that she was terminated from her employment with the Department?
A. Yes, it was the day that we found out that she had been in her office for two hours with a juvenile.
Q. All right. And that was again CY ?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the specific concern about that two hours with the juvenile?
A. The concern was no staff should be behind a closed door with a juvenile for any amount of time, let alone two hours.
Q. Had you ever heard of her doing that sort of thing before?
A. No, not in a room behind a closed door.
Q. All right. Do you know if any reports to that effect were made by staff, that she had spent time behind closed doors with CY or an y other juveniles?
A. Nottome.
Q. Do you know if they were made to anyone else?
A. I can't answer that. It didn't come up to me.
Q. But is that, you don't know?
A. I can't answer the question because -- no, I don't know.
Q. Okay, that's all I want to know. If you don't know something you can say, "I don't know."

Was there any other conduct of McCormick's with respect to CY or other juvenile males that caused you or anyone else concern at the facility?
A. Yes, it was reported to me that Julie may have
boundary issues. So, we had that investigated.
Q. What do you mean by "boundary issues"?
A. What I was told is that she was spending time in the Solutions unit, which was not appropriate. And so, we had it investigated.
Q. And who investigated that?
A. The first time it was investigated we had it investigated by Bev Wilder, who was a program manager from St. Anthony.
Q. All right. Why did you pick her? Did you pick her to do that?
A. At that point it was -- it looked like we had heard something -- we had heard that there could be something going on. She was going to be at the facility, and so we asked her if she would do the investigation because it was from the outside.
Q. When you say "something going on," what do you mean?
A. The boundary issues. There was a concern -there was a report that CY may be infatuated by Julie.
Q. Do you know who made that report?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you know when that was made?
A. No, I don't. I don't remember.
Q. And what did Ms. Wilder find?
A. She said that it looked like there might be a crush and that we should watch Julie's -- just let Julie know that she wasn't supposed to be around CY. So, that was the report. That was the report and that's what the instructions were for Julie.
Q. All right. Was there any concern by anyone at all that there might be a sexual relationship between the two of them?
A. No, not to my knowledge. Not that got reported to me.
Q. Do you know if that was reported to anyone else?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Was Ms. McCormick -- were her interactions with CY monitored in any way?
A. I believe so after that because there was progressive discipline and -- she was monitored. When she was spending time with him, then there was progressive discipline that happened.
Q. And what did that consist of, the progressive discipline?
A. Verbal and then written.
Q. And who handled that?
A. Well, Julie -- Julie was supervised by
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Superintendent Grimm, so Betty would have handled those disciplines with the assistance of Human Resources.
Q. Anyone specific in Human Resources?
A. I don't know for sure, but my guess is that it would have been Pat and Julie.
Q. Who was it that monitored Julie McCormick?
A. Well, Betty is her supervisor, so it would be Betty that would be responsible for that.
Q. And do you know that she did monitor Julie?
A. I -- yes, because of the progressive discipline.
Q. All right. Did you ever discuss Ms. Grimm's monitoring of Julie McCormick with Julie Cloud?
A. Yes, we did discuss that. And then Julie discussed it -- I mean, what I remember is that we discussed it and then Julie sent an e-mail saying that she thinks that she needed to do more. And I talked with Betty about getting out there and walking around more.
Q. All right. And did you discuss with Ms. Cloud why it was she felt that more needed to be done?
A. No. I mean, mostly because what her concern was is just watching it on the monitor and wanting Betty to get out there. And what my understanding is Betty was out there walking around doing her rounds on a
regular basis, so I just asked her to step up her rounds.
Q. All right. Did you have any concerns that Betty was not doing enough to monitor Julie McCormick?
A. With the information that I had at the time,
Q. Were any staff members notified to keep an eye on the situation?
A. Not to my knowledge. I mean, we -- in the

Department of Juvenile Corrections we all look out for each other and we all should be monitoring each other and making sure that people aren't put in situations that are compromising.
Q. All right.
A. So, in that respect, I believe that everyone has the right and the responsibility of reporting if there's something that's not appropriate.
Q. Was any staff told that there was any kind of impropriety to watch out for between Ms. McCormick and CY ?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Are you aware of whether Ms. McCormick might have spent similar time inappropriately with JD
, another juvenile?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if she ever spent time behind closed doors with him?
A. No.
Q. The same thing with $\quad \mathrm{CM}$, are you aware of any inappropriate time spent with him?
A. No. When I was made aware of inappropriate time, I dealt with it.
Q. And what do you mean by that?
A. When I was made aware of the two hours, which was inappropriate time, then I said, "That's inappropriate. We need to let Julie know that until the investigation is done she needs to be out of the facility."
Q. All right. And who was it that made you aware of the two-hour --
A. Betty called me.
Q. Did she say how she knew about it?
A. She said that it had been reported to Pat

Thomson, Human Resources.
Q. Do you know who reported it to Pat?
A. Sarah Cerda.
Q. Did you ever hear that Sarah Cerda had walked in on McCormick and CY in a state of undress?
A. No, I did not hear that.
Q. Or in a state where they were in close
physical contact or sexual contact?
A. I did not hear that.
Q. Are you aware of any reports to that effect by SSO Ramos?
A. No, I -- in the investigation there was some of that discussion, but prior to that I did not hear that.
Q. And what was that discussion?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. What was that discussion that you just referred to?
A. During the investigation it came out that Ramos -- Ramos had talked with Julie about his concerns with her boundaries.
Q. And do you know when he had spoken with her about those?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Did you find out whether Sarah Cerda might have walked in on the two of them either in a state of undress or inappropriately physically touching?
A. What I was told was that they were not physically touching, that they were close to each other and -- but they weren't touching. That's what I was told by the investigation.
Q. Did anyone have any concern that Ms. McCormick
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enjoyed CY apparent infatuation with her?
A. I -- no, I did not hear that.
Q. All right. You mentioned progressive discipline earlier. What was involved in that? I think we had gotten to the counseling stage with Betty Grimm.
A. Right. Verbal warning, written waming, and the next stage was we were in the process of putting Julie out for five days because she continued to have -you know, she continued to go down to Solutions or be available when CY was around.
Q. All right. And was that reflected in a notice of contemplated action?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if Julie McCormick's movements with CY were tracked in the movement log at the control booth?
A. I don't know the answer to that. They should have been because all movement is supposed to be tracked.
Q. Did you ever find out if records of those movements existed?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware if anyone ever asked anyone to delete movement logs concerning Julie McCormick's interactions with CY ?
A. No.
Q. Or with any other juvenile?
A. No, records should not be deleted.
Q. Do you know who has the authority to delete records, movement logs specifically?
A. No, I don't know who has that authority.
Q. Do you know who has the ability?
A. No.
Q. Could McCormick have been placed on leave or suspended prior to the time at which she spent those two hours with CY ?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for a legal conclusion.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) I mean as a matter of policy or discipline under something that was discussed or on the table?

MR. COLLAER: The same objection. To the extent that that asks you to reveal any discussions you had with legal counsel, then I would instruct you not to answer. To the extent you can answer the question, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I can't remember the time frame between those. I know that we were doing progressive discipline.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) And did you discuss that
with Betty Grimm?
A. The progressive discipline?
Q. Well, the possibility of suspending her sooner rather than later in the process?
A. That doesn't make sense to me, what you're asking me. So, you might have to ask me a different way.
Q. Well, let me ask you this: As you sit here now, do you wish you had done anything differently?

MR. COLLAER: Objection to the form of the question, incomplete hypothetical, calls for speculation. I'm not going to tell you not to answer, but if you have an opinion about that one way or another, then go ahead.

THE WITNESS: With the information that we had, I believe we were doing the progressive discipline that we needed to, with the information we had. Had we been given different information, then yes. But with the information that we had, we were doing what we needed to do.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Do you feel like you did everything possible to protect CY ?

MR. COLLAER: Objection, that's been asked and
answered. Go ahead and answer it again.
THE WITNESS: With the information we had.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Has anyone else ever expressed a belief that something should have been done to protect CY ?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for speculation. If somebody told you that you should have done something differently, then go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Not with the information that we had. I mean, no.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) I mean, has anyone told you that, though? Not based on the information, but has anyone ever said something to the effect that something should have been done to intervene sooner?

MR. COLLAER: The same objection, it's an incomplete hypothetical and calls for speculation. But go ahead. Assuming someone told you you should have done something differently, go ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm sure in hindsight lots of people told me that, but can I tell you one person? No. But with the information that we had, I believe we did what we needed to do.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Do you know if the incident with CY was reported as a PREA incident?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who made that report?
A. Well, ultimately it went to Joe Blume, who is our PREA coordinator for the State.
Q. Do you know if an incident report was prepared?
A. I believe so.
Q. And was the issue reported to the Department of Health and Welfare?
A. The issue was reported to the department of law enforcement, to the Nampa Police Department.
Q. But do you know if it was reported to Health and Welfare?
A. No.
Q. Who would have been responsible for reporting it to the Department of Health and Welfare?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, it assumes that it was required. But go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: The first person that knew that there could have been a situation. At that point we didn't know what the situation was and we did report it to law enforcement.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) As far as you know, did Ms. Grimm's decision to retire in late 2012 have anything to do with the Julie McCormick incident?
A. No, Ms. Grimm had been talking about retirement for several years.
Q. Did you or anyone else tell her that she should retire?
A. No.

MR. SCHOPPE: Off the record for just a moment.
(Luncheon recess taken.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Earlier you had mentioned a report by Bev Wilder concerning Julie McCormick. Was that a written report?
A. I don't believe it was. I believe she just reported to us that it looked like there was -- it looked like there were boundary issues and that it should be watched.
Q. Did she express any concerns that it could be of a sexual or romantic nature, the relationship between the two of them?
A. No, just as I said before, there was an
infatuation, but not anything that -- just boundary issues, to watch it.
Q. Can you tell me what a staff assist is, if you know?
A. What a staff assist is?
Q. Yes.
A. You know, I don't really know what a staff assist is.
Q. Is there a policy at the Department concerning Facebook friendships or other relationships involving staff and former juveniles?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me what that is?
A. That they're not supposed to be friends with former juveniles.
Q. Was Bob Glenn fired for violating that policy?
A. There was a disciplinary action on Bob Glenn that included some Facebook violations, but also some other violations as well, based on an investigation.
Q. What were those, those other issues?
A. Providing food for the kids and pulling them out individually and talking to them.
Q. Was the progressive discipline system initiated with Mr. Glenn?
A. You know, I don't know the sequence of events with that. I know that there was discussion with him, but as far as progressive discipline -- when the investigation was done and the issues -- what we did was based on what the investigation came back with. We terminated him.
Q. All right. In your opinion, were those issues
more or less serious than the issues that presented themselves with Julie McCormick and CY ?
A. Well, in my opinion because of the boundary issues and buying food for the kids and that, those were issues that I had been made aware of that were serious issues. The issues that I had been made aware of with Julie McCormick did not rise to that level. When -- you know, as soon as I knew what those issues were with Julie McCormick, you know, the time in the room, then that was dealt with.
Q. Since you started as the Director, has anyone ever reported to you or are you aware of any reports that employees might be engaging in time card fraud?
A. Yes, I was made aware of that by the Nampa Police Department.
Q. And tell me about that, please. What were you told?
A. The Nampa Police Department called me and said that they were given some information about time card fraud. And so, I gave them access to time sheets and it came back that there was some fraud.
Q. And was that an allegation against someone in particular?
A. Dave Rohrbach and Glenda Rohrbach.
Q. And do you know where the Nampa PD got that
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information?
A. No. As far as they knew, it was anonymous. It was just dropped off at their facility.
Q. And did Mr. Rohrbach and Ms. Rohrbach retire shortly after that?
A. They retired -- you know, I don't know the sequence of events. They might have already been retired by then, by the time those time card frauds -it was real close. It was right in that same kind of time sequence.
Q. Did you ever hear of any complaints or concerns expressed by employees concerning the Rohrbach's time card fraud?
A. No, I hadn't.
Q. Did you have any discussions with Mr. Rohrbach about time card fraud being a reason for him to retire?
A. No, I didn't have a discussion about that being the reason for him to retire, no.
Q. Did you ever suggest to him that he ought to retire because of those allegations?
A. No.
Q. Since you became Director in 2009 did anyone ever express to you that -- did any employee ever express to you that the facility was unreasonably unsafe for staff or juveniles?
A. No employee ever came to me and said that. I'm trying to think. No one came to me directly and said that, no.
Q. Did you hear about it somehow?
A. Through the Performance-based Standards, staff fearing for their safety.
Q. And do you recall when that was?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And what was it that you learned through the PbS system?
A. That there were some staff that feared for their safety.
Q. Was that an increase over the prior state of affairs?
A. That particular Performance-based Standard goes up and down depending upon the facility and the kids that are in the facility.
Q. Do you happen to recall whether that might have been in 2010 ?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Did you ever find out why it was that staff were concerned for their safety?
A. There were assaults on staff, assaults on other kids.
Q. Did you ever find out why that situation
seemed to change or get worse?
MR. COLLAER: Objection to the form of the question, assumes facts not in evidence. But go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Like I said, it ebbed and flowed.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Was it anything as far as you could tell that was either programmatic, related to the way in which the facility was run, or perhaps related to a single juvenile, anything like that?
A. It ebbed and flowed by the kids that were in there.
Q. Since the time you became Director did anyone ever tell you that they believed that they were suffering retaliation?
A. No. You know, as I think about it, I do think Rhonda talked about that, with the hit man. And so, I think that she felt that there was some retaliation at the facility. And Kim McCormick thought, felt that there was some retaliation. When we looked into it and I talked to folks, I didn't feel that there was any retaliation.
Q. What did you talk about with Kim McCormick?
A. What kind of adverse actions had happened.
Q. What did she have to say about that?
A. No adverse employee actions -- or no adverse
actions, just the way people treated her in the -- you know, her co-workers.
Q. And the adverse employee action, was that her term or is that your term?
A. I just -- I asked her to explain to me what was going on.
Q. And what did she have to say to you?
A. She just felt like that she wasn't being included in things.
Q. Did she say why she felt that was?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall when that was?
A. Within the last year.
Q. Are you aware of whether any employees have used state vehicles for personal uses?
A. No, the policy indicates that you can take a state vehicle home at night if you're going to leave early in the morning. And so, state employees will do that.
Q. And when you say "leave" --
A. So, if you are going someplace on state business and you're having to leave at 6:00 in the morning, then our policy indicates that you can take it home the night before so you don't have to drive to the facility, pick up the vehicle, and then go.
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Q. Did you ever authorize Bev Ashton to use a state vehicle for her commute to and from work?
A. That situation was developed way before I became the Director. And it is reviewed on a regular basis.
Q. Okay.
A. What it is is Bev Ashton is the district liaison in District 5. And so, the vehicle is actually kept at the Shoshone County -- I'm sorry, the Lincoln County -- in Shoshone City, the Lincoln County Courthouse. And so, she will drive to the Lincoln County Courthouse and pick up the vehicle and -- because that is centrally located in all of the eight counties that are part of District 5 .
Q. How about Honalee Gallegos, does she have a state vehicle that she's able to use for a personal commute?
A. Not to my knowledge. There are -- each facility -- each district has access to state vehicles and, you know, they can pick them up and take them for their use wherever they need to go.
Q. But you've never authorized it for that purpose?
A. For personal use, no.
Q. Since the time you have become Director has
anyone ever expressed concern to you that the safety of juveniles and staff is jeopardized by the inappropriately fast reintegration of juveniles after violent assaults or similar incidents?
A. That was discussed at the all-staff meeting and I believe that Tom Knoff has talked with me about that.
Q. And what did he have to say about that?
A. The use -- what he said is that the reintegration of kids is too fast, that -- and that they needed more ability to lockdown kids.
Q. And is that something you agreed with or disagreed with?
A. My belief is that if a juvenile needs lockdown, they should be locked down. When they're ready to reintegrate, then they need to be reintegrated.
Q. And was that a difference in approach or policy between the two of you?
A. Between the two of us meaning me and Tom?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. How would you summarize his position on it?
A. His position was that -- to lock down kids for a period of time.
Q. What was that period of time?
A. What I recall is 72 hours.
Q. Did that violate the juvenile's rights as far as you're concerned?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for a legal conclusion. But go ahead and answer if you can.

THE WITNESS: Kids are not supposed to be locked down any more than they absolutely have to. Kids don't learn in their rooms. They're not rehabilitated if they're locked in their rooms. They're rehabilitated when they're in programming and working with staff.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) My question had been, though: As far as you were concerned, I understand you're not a lawyer, was that policy of Mr. Knoff's violating the juveniles' rights?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, incomplete hypothetical, and calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: So, my answer would be it's the policy of our agency to get kids into communities as quick as you can. They do that by being rehabilitated. If they're locked in their rooms they're not being rehabilitated.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) I don't believe that's quite responsive. I was looking for your impression of
whether that was violating their rights.
MR. COLLAER: Again, that's an incomplete hypothetical, calls for a legal conclusion, and calls for speculation. What circumstances? What kind of an assault? It all depends, Counsel.

MR. SCHOPPE: Well, please don't coach the witness.

MR. COLLAER: I'm not. I'm asking you to give a complete hypothetical if you're asking for a hypothetical opinion.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) No, I'm asking for your opinion of what you just summarized as Mr. Knoff's position, 72-hour lockdowns. So, as far as you were concerned, did that violate juveniles' rights?

MR. COLLAER: Objection, that's been asked and answered and I'll restate the prior objections.

THE WITNESS: I'll leave that to my legal team.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Did you ever tell him that that was violating their rights, Mr. Knoff, I mean?
A. I don't recall ever telling him directly, Mr. Knoff, that that was violating their rights.
Q. And you never formed an opinion of it one way or another?

MR. COLLAER: Objection, that misstates her
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testimony.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Correct me if I'm wrong.
A. What I believe is that kids can only be treated if they're out in the group or, you know, they can't be treated or rehabilitated if they're in their rooms.
Q. Did Mr. Knoff or anyone else ever express concern that reintegrating juveniles too quickly violated the rights of other juveniles?
A. It's staff's responsibility to determine when the best time to reintegrate a juvenile. And it has to be on an individualized basis based on their professional opinion on when it's appropriate, when it's safe for staff and the other juveniles to reintegrate the juvenile. And so, that has to be on an individualized basis. And each case would have to be looked at differently based on what the juvenile did, based on the reintegration plan.
Q. Was Mr. Knoff not doing that, the individual analysis you just described?
A. Well, it's my belief that that's what the plan was, is to let kids out. Now, what he and his staff did as far as it was -- it was never my directive that kids could not be locked in their rooms. It was my directive that kids be reintegrated as soon as they possibly could
based on what the individual analysis was.
Q. Was there a particular standard, something along the lines of a Performance-based Standard or something like that that you were trying to apply to the way in which lockdowns were approached?
A. What I had been told is that if a juvenile is in lockdown, the intent is to get them out as soon as they can reintegrate their group. And if they're not out in 24 hours, there has to be a due process hearing to determine whether or not they stay in their room or if they're -- if they're brought out. But every 24 hours there has to be a due process hearing. And if in that due process hearing it's appropriate for the young person to stay in their room, then that's what's appropriate.
Q. All right. And who told you that that is the way things should work?
A. That's my legal team.
Q. Was there a different policy in place -- well, let me ask you this: When did this disagreement occur between you and Mr. Knoff?
A. When -- probably when I was made aware that kids were locked in their rooms for long periods of time.
Q. And who made you aware of that?
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A. I knew that was going to be your next
question. I can't remember who made me aware of that. Possibly Legal.
Q. How about Laura Roters?
A. Laura wouldn't have made me aware of that. She probably would have made Betty aware of it and Betty made me aware of it.
Q. So, were any policy changes made as a result of this disagreement that you had with Mr. Knoff?
A. Not that I can remember.
Q. It was just a matter of putting into effect the policy that's already written?
A. Practice, yes.
Q. Did anyone ever use the term "lockdown at staff convenience" in discussing this with you?
A. That was a term that was used when O\&A specifically would lock kids down to have their team meetings.
Q. Do you know one way or the other if that was simply for staff convenience versus safety or for some other reason?
A. It was so that the staff could have their team meeting.
Q. Do you know how long that practice had been in effect?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Did anyone ever tell you how long that practice had been in effect?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. Was your concern that O\&A staff weren't doing their jobs properly?
A. No, my concern was that kids were locked in their rooms for no particular reason.
Q. Are you aware of whether anyone ever suggested that O\&A staff were not doing their jobs?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. A bit ago you had mentioned an all-staff meeting. Are you referring to an all-staff meeting that occurred in November of 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. We were talking about fast reintegration.

What was it that was brought up there at that meeting according to your recollection?
A. According to my recollection, we talked about -- what was brought up was taking tools away, which was the lockdown, 10-hour shifts, and hiring practices. That's what I recall about that all-staff meeting.
Q. And would it be fair to say that staff were upset about these issues?
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A. Yes.
Q. So, we've already discussed the lockdown issue and that's what you mean by "taking a tool away"?
A. Yes.
Q. You mean like a disciplinary tool?
A. That's my belief is that's what they thought, that it was a disciplinary tool, a punishment tool.
Q. And what was the 10 -hour shift concern?
A. The take-away of 10 -hour shifts from staff, a concern that they didn't -- they weren't able to have 10-hour shifts.
Q. Had they had 10-hour shifts up until that point or somewhere around that time?
A. The 10 -hour shifts changed when we had to do some changes in budget to assure that we had staff coverage.
Q. Had there been problems with staff coverage?
A. Yes.
Q. What kinds of problems?
A. Just having enough coverage for all of the different -- for all of the different shifts, running a 24/7 operation.
Q. And what took the place of the 10 -hour shifts?
A. 8-hour shifts.
Q. And did those improve staff coverage?
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A. Yes.
Q. Was there any specific reason -- and we're still talking about O\&A staff; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there any particular reason that the O\&A staff were concerned about the 10 -hour shifts being taken away?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for speculation as to their state of mind. If they said something, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: All I heard is that: "When do we get our 10-hour shifts back?"
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Did anyone tell you why they wanted those specifically? What was more desirable about 10 -hour shifts versus the 8 -hour shifts?
A. They didn't specifically tell me why. They just asked me when they would get their 10-hour shifts back.
Q. And what was your response?
A. For a bit it was that: "No, we're staying with the 8-hour shifts." And then I can't remember exactly time frame, but then 1 said: "If you can show me that you can have the same amount of coverage with the 10 -hour shifts that you did with the 8 -hour shifts, then we'll consider it." And they couldn't come up with
the same coverage.
Q. Do you recall who seemed to be upset about the shift change specifically?

MR. COLLAER: You're talking about at the staff meeting?

MR. SCHOPPE: Yes.
THE WITNESS: No, I can't remember who. I can't remember who.
Q. (BYMR. SCHOPPE) All right.
A. Because it was brought up a couple of times and I just can't remember the people that brought that up.
Q. All right. And we're talking about the same general group of O\&A staff, though?
A. Yes, I believe -- yeah, it was the O\&A staff that had the 10 -hour shifts.
Q. All right. You mentioned hiring practices. That was another topic; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that about at the all-staff meeting?
A. It was just about our hiring procedures and they asked what the hiring practices were and I just went through the process.
Q. And did they lay out specific concerns or examples of problems with the hiring process?
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A. You know, I can't recall if they laid out the specific concerns or if I brought up that -- my guess is it was over Laura Roters' hiring. I can't remember if they brought it up or if I did, but that was what the issue was.
Q. All right. Do you remember those concerns being raised in connection with Julie McCormick as well?
A. No, I don't remember them being raised with Julie McCormick.
Q. At some point around this time, maybe a little bit before, I think probably before this, did you become aware of a petition that was circulating?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you become aware of that?
A. I was told that there was a petition that was being circulated around the Nampa facility that people were signing.
Q. Who told you that?
A. Betty.
Q. What did she tell you about the petition?
A. Just that there was a petition being signed about Laura Roters being hired as the unit manager.
Q. All right. Do you know who was circulating it?
A. Ray Gregston.
Q. Do you know of anybody else who signed it?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Or do you know of anybody who supported that?
A. No, I really don't know who supported it.
Q. What was it as far as you recall that people
were upset about with respect to Laura Roters' hiring?
A. Qualifications, I believe.
Q. What do you mean by that?
A. Specifically supervision.
Q. Lack of supervision?
A. Lack of the -- lack of supervision experience or education.
Q. At the time were you aware of what was being referred to in terms of lack of supervisory experience?
A. Yes.
Q. At that point I think Laura Roters had been an employee of the Department for some time; is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. And as I understand it, she had applied for the position of unit manager; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you ever speak with her concerning her application to become the unit manager?
A. I spoke with her after she was awarded the position and then it was taken away from her.
Q. All right.
A. And she came down to headquarters and I spoke with her. I looked at her -- because of the supervisory experience, I -- she and I both looked at her transcripts together and went through each of her classes and there wasn't supervisory experience on her transcript. That's the one time I had a conversation with her about that.
Q. And when you said the position was "taken away from her," what did you mean?
A. She was hired as the unit manager and then there was question about her experience in supervision and then through review it was taken away from her.
Q. All right. Was she upset about that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall who it was that raised the concerns over her lack of supervisory experience?
A. I was notified by Julie Cloud.
Q. What did she say?
A. And she was -- it was brought to her attention by Mark Freckleton.
Q. Do you know why he noticed or was interested?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, calls for speculation. If you know what Mr. Freckleton was thinking, go ahead.
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THE WITNESS: I really don't know what he was thinking.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Do you know if he had also applied for the position?
A. I believe he did.
Q. After the position was taken away from

Ms. Roters, as you put it, did the position open up again for applicants?
A. Not for a bit.
Q. And do you recall how long that period of time might have been?
A. Longer than I wanted.
Q. Why do you say that?
A. Because the Division of Human Resources reviewed the qualifications of the position and it took much longer than I thought it would for them to review the qualifications of the position.
Q. All right. How did they become involved? You're talking about the State Division of Human Resources?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did they become involved?
A. They became involved because we pulled the position from Laura. And Julie and I discussed it and she reviewed the applications and she changed the
scoring for Laura. And because she changed the scoring
for Laura so that she didn't pass, then DHR became involved.
Q. Is it correct to say that this led to a probationary period for the Department of Juvenile Corrections Human Resources?
A. Yes.
Q. How was it that -- what did Division of Human Resources do in reviewing that position?
A. They brought in a unit manager from -- they brought in -- well, a representative from all three of our facilities to discuss the unit manager position.
So, a unit manager from -- no, it wasn't. It was the superintendent from Lewiston and the program managers from Nampa and St. Anthony to determine what the criteria for a unit manager would be. So, the people that supervised the unit manager were the people that determined what those qualifications should be.
Q. Can you tell me who those people were, their names?
A. Kevin Bernatz, Dave Rohrbach, and Bev Ashton, Beverly Ashton -- I mean Beverly Wilder. I'm sorry, Beverly Wilder.
Q. And what happened with respect to reviewing the position? Were qualifications changed or did
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anything else happen with that?
A. I think the criteria and the questions became clearer so that people would know how to answer the questions.
Q. Were any of the supervisory experience requirements changed in any way?
A. You know, I believe they were, but I can't tell you specifically what those were.
Q. Were you involved in the review process at all?
A. No, I wasn't. It was a DHR review.
Q. As far as you know, did you or anybody else at Juvenile Corrections ask the Division of Human Resources to conduct that review?
A. You know, I don't know the answer to that. I know that it was such a mess that we welcomed the review.
Q. Do you know if Julie Cloud was involved in that process?
A. Yes. Well, she wasn't involved in the process of reviewing the unit manager position because that was all DHR.
Q. How was she involved?
A. Well, she was involved, as I said before, in the first time review and she reviewed Laura Roters.
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But once it was given to DHR, then it was pretty much DHR and those three people that I told you about that came up with the process.
Q. All right. Did you ever talk with Vicki

Tokita at the Division of Human Resources regarding that review?
A. Yes, I did several times because I kept asking her how much longer it would be.
Q. Do you recall how long it took?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And is it fair to say that at some point thereafter the position was opened up again for applicants?
A. Yes, it was after DHR did their process.
Q. And is it correct to say that Laura Roters again applied for that position?
A. Yes.
Q. And that she got the position?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Are you aware of whether there was any difference in her qualifications?
A. In the meantime she took some supervisory
classes.
Q. Did you participate in any way in the hiring process that second time around?

Page 107
A. No.
Q. Did you talk with her about her reapplication for the position?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Do you know if Julie Cloud did?
A. I can't answer that, no.
Q. Or Betty Grimm?
A. I can't answer that either.
Q. All right. Are you aware of whether the supervisory experience requirements for the position were reduced?

MR. COLLAER: Objection, that's been asked and answered. Butgo ahead.

THE WITNESS: Like I said, I don't know that they were reduced. I know that Laura took some supervisory classes.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) All right. And where was that position assigned again within the Department?
Unit manager for?
A. The unit manager?
Q. For Choices?
A. It was the unit manager for Choices and Solutions.
Q. And who had occupied that position before Laura Roters, immediately prior to Laura Roters?
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A. Dave Rohrbach.
Q. At the all-staff meeting did staff express
concerns that the requirements for the position had been changed to accommodate Laura Roters?
A. I don't recall that being one of the discussions.
Q. At some point Tom Knoff was terminated; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was that?

MR. COLLAER: Hold on just a second. I'm not sure if that case is under a confidentiality order or --

MS. NANCY BISHOP: It is.
MR. COLLAER: If it is, then she can't talk about it.

MR. SCHOPPE: She can't talk about the facts of why he was terminated?

MR. COLLAER: I think the release is that broad.

MR. SCHOPPE: Is that an order, a court order, or is that just an agreement?

MR. COLLAER: It is an agreement and part of the court order.

MR. SCHOPPE: It's part of a court order?
MR. COLLAER: I would have to check, but I
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believe it incorporates the release, which has a confidentiality clause in it.

MR. SCHOPPE: So, there's a n actual lawsuit filed?

MR. COLLAER: I know it was through the Personnel Commission, but again, there is a -- I know there is a release agreement with a confidentiality clause. And so, she cannot violate the terms of that confidentiality agreement.

MR. SCHOPPE: The thing is I'm going to have to keep the deposition open because --

MR. COLLAER: That's fine. I understand that.
MR. SCHOPPE: -- because I don't believe that to be the case in the context of -- typically orders like that or agreements like that make an exception for testifying in depositions or court proceedings or things like that. So, you're instructing her not to answer that?

MR. COLLAER: Yeah, I guess until we can address that either with the Court or with Mr. Knoff. I mean, I don't want to do something that breaches that and creates an issue with Mr. Knoff. But I understand that you may have to come back and ask about that particular thing and I don't have a quarrel with that.

MR. SCHOPPE: All right.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Well, at any rate, at some point the position that Mr. Knoff held in Observation \& Assessment became vacant; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. What position was that?
A. It was a lead rehab tech I believe is what it was.
Q. At one point had he been a unit manager in O\&A?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it fair to say that that unit manager position was reclassified in a way that was sort of a demotion to lead rehab tech?
A. What happened was we were under a reduction in force and so, we had to look at all three facilities to determine how we could reduce positions in order to deal with the economic downturn. And that was one of the positions that Nampa said, "We can do this without that position."
Q. All right. And was that commonly known as a hiring freeze or something like that, the reduction in force?
A. No, it was a holdback based on the economy.

And all of us had to come up with our reduction in our budgets. And so, all state agencies were given the
directive to reduce -- to reduce their budgets.
Q. All right. So, is it fair to say that that occurred in 2009, that reclassification?
A. I believe it was the beginning of 2010 .
Q. Okay.
A. Late 2009. It was December of 2009.
Q. So, when that position became open once again, how was that filled as far as you know?
A. The position didn't really come open again.

What happened is when Tom left, we knew we needed to do
something with the O\&A program. So, we just moved the unit manager position over there and that was Laura.
Q. Was she first assigned as the acting lead rehab tech?
A. Over there?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I think we just reassigned her
responsibilities as the unit manager and asked her to
supervise O\&A staff.
Q. Was consideration given to any other candidates for that position?
A. She was the only one that held the position as unit manager at that point.
Q. So, was there no longer a unit manager position in Choices and Solutions when she was
reassigned?
A. We -- I can't remember how this happened, but we redid some -- we reclassified another position for a unit manager position and then we put that out for, you know -- and had a process, a competitive process for that.
Q. So, someone took over the unit manager slot for Choices and Solutions after she left; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And where there hadn't been a unit manager position in O\&A since early 2010 or so, there was then at that point a unit manager position?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there any consideration given as to whether that should have been opened up for applicants to apply for that position?
A. Laura was the only person in that position, so there wasn't -- that was the only unit manager position at the time at Nampa.
Q. Prior to Mr. Knoff's departure from O\&A and the Department, did you or anyone else as far as you know discuss Ms. Roters' assignment to O\&A with her?
A. Prior to Mr. Knoff's -- no. When Mr. Knoff left is when we determined that we needed to do
something with O\&A.
Q. What was that something that you needed to do?
A. To develop a system at O\&A, to develop some programmatic structure.
Q. And had it not had programmatic structure before?
A. Well, Mr. Knoff had a system, but when he left, then we had to figure out who was going to be the supervisor that could provide it some structure.
Q. After Ms. Roters left the Choices and

Solutions units, when was it that the reclassification, as you put it, occurred to -- when was it that there was a reclassification that created a unit manager position over in Choices and Solutions again?
A. And I can't remember the -- I can't remember that, what that time frame was. I just really can't remember that.
Q. Would it have been closely after she left?
A. I can't remember that.
Q. Who was promoted to that position?
A. Eric Cotton.
Q. And who was it that participated in the decision to assign Ms. Roters to the O\&A unit manager slot?

MR. COLLAER: Could you read that question
back.
(Record read back.)
MR. COLLAER: Thanks.
THE WITNESS: It would have been Betty's decision to -- you know, because Betty is responsible for that -- Betty was responsible for that facility.
She discussed it with me and Frank Riley about what direction to go. And between the three of us, that was the plan that was developed.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Is it fair to say that Julie Cloud had conducted an audit of the unit manager position in 2009 or 2010 that resulted in its reclassification?

MR. COLLAER: Which unit manager position?
MR. SCHOPPE: The O\&A unit manager position.
THE WITNESS: I believe -- I believe that did happen.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) What changed about the situation at O\&A that required a unit manager position again in 2012, which I think that's when this position was set up; is that right?
A. That sounds right to me.
Q. All right.
A. And what I can tell you is that Betty
determined she wanted something different to happen in

O\&A. And each facility superintendent has the authority to do that kind of restructuring.
Q. All right. Do you know why it was she made that determination?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Do you recall if she shared that with you, even if you don't remember what it was?
A. I'm sure we talked about it. I just can't recall.
Q. Do you know if Betty ever said that Laura Roters was sent to "clean house" in O\&A?
A. I don't know that she ever said that, no.
Q. Did you ever hear of someone saying that she said that?
A. No.
Q. Was Laura Roters sent to O\&A to get rid of O\&A staff?
A. No.
Q. Did Ms. Roters express any concern to you or Ms. Grimm about the negative consequences falling back on her as a result of her restructuring O\&A?
A. She did ask me -- I don't know if it was negative consequences, but she did ask me -- she did ask me why she was being sent to O\&A. And my response was she had the ability to develop structures, I think is
what we talked about.
Q. Did she ask for any kind of a written guarantee from either you or Director Grimm -- I'm sorry, Superintendent Grimm, that might insulate her against negative consequences or liability or anything like that in connection with her restructuring of O\&A?
A. No.
Q. You never gave her any kind of a written memorandum of understanding or anything like that?
A. Boy, not that I can remember. She was -- she was still on probation as a unit manager.
Q. From her time in Choices and Solutions?
A. Yes.
Q. How long had she been in that position at the time she was transferred to O\&A?
A. I don't recall, but I know that she was still on probation.
Q. And are you aware of whether she had trouble with O\&A staff in restructuring O\&A?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question. It's vague.

THE WITNESS: So, I don't -- do you want to ask me that again? I don't understand what it is that you're asking.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Did she ever tell you that
there were problems that she encountered in dealing with O\&A staff as she went about the task of restructuring O\&A?
A. Laura and I did not talk. She probably -because I sent Frank Riley out there on detail to help her with that whole restructuring and working with her. And so, my guess is that she and Frank talked about that. But as far as Laura talking with me directly, no.
Q. Did Frank or Betty Grimm ever tell you that she was having trouble with O\&A staff in restructuring the Department?
A. I'm sure they did. I can't remember specifics, but I'm sure that -- I'm sure that they did.
Q. Did you ever hear that Betty Grimm told O\&A staff that they needed to support Ms. Roters in her changes or find employment elsewhere, or words to that effect?
A. I have heard that in these depositions, but I had not heard that before.
Q. And did you view that as an appropriate statement for her to have made?
A. I wasn't there. I didn't hear the context under which it was said. So, I can't really answer that.
Q. Are you aware of whether there were
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resignations from among the O\&A staff following Ms. Roters' assignment to the position?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And what do you know about that?
A. I know that Diane Camell went to work for adult correction.
Q. Do you know what happened to anybody else?
A. I know that -- I can't really remember the time frame for this, but I know that Todd Inman quit. I just can't remember when in all of that, if it was after Laura took over or not, took over O\&A or not. I can't remember exactly when that happened.
Q. Did you ever learn anything about why anyone left O\&A, either resignations or quitting or anything like that?
A. No. I believe Todd Inman is a youth pastor and it was I believe he wanted to do more of that type of work. And Diane Camell got a job at IDOC.
Q. Did anyone ever tell you that they had quit because -- or left because they were angry or upset, and specifically with respect to Ms. Roters' restructuring of the Department?
A. No, I don't remember that, but those wouldn't come to me directly. I do remember one Sunday when I was out there that Todd had told me that he wasn't happy
with the direction things were going, but I think that was more about the not having the ability to lock kids down than it was with Laura, but I can't -- again, because I don't recall when that was. But I know that Todd did when I was out there on a Sunday tell me that he wasn't happy with the direction that things were going in O\&A.
Q. Did he say why specifically?
A. No, he just said he's not happy with the direction.
Q. Are you aware of whether any of the O\&A staff indicated that they felt the Department was less safe after Ms. Roters started restructuring things?
A. No, I did not hear that.
Q. Have you ever heard any of the O\&A staff described as belligerent or challenging?
A. Did I ever hear that?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Did you ever hear anything about O\&A staff fearing to criticize Ms. Roters because of what Ms. Grimm had said?
A. That did not come up to my attention, no.
Q. Stepping back to the petition that we were talking about earlier, after that all-staff meeting in
which the petition was discussed, what happened? Did you take any steps to address the concerns that were presented there?
A. Steps to address the concerns that were presented at the all-staff?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. There were groups -- well, I met with as many staff as I could to talk with them about what it was. We took notes of those and then staff compiled all of that and started working on plans to improve the systems.
Q. Do you know if those plans were effected?
A. I believe that some of them were.
Q. Any recollection of which ones in particular?
A. No, because there were different groups that were working on different parts of it. Because it was a facility-wide -- you know, there were facility-wide plans. And I left that to the facility to do the improvement plans.
Q. Did you ever discuss the petition with Ray Gregston?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you talk about with him?
A. We, Betty and I -- he came to Betty's office. I was there. We talked about the petition and asked him
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if in the future if he would follow the regular problem solving process that we have prior to filing another petition. We talked about what some of his concerns were.
Q. Is there any policy against petitions?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of whether or not staff have ever expressed a belief that the problem solving process doesn't work?
A. Not to me they haven't.
Q. Have you ever heard of staff -- and actually, it's the same question I was asking before. Not whether they've said it to you, but have you heard that?
A. Not -- well, in this lawsuit process I've been made aware of it, but not prior to that.
Q. And the same question: Are you aware of whether staff ever expressed concerns that the employee disciplinary process was unfair?
A. No.
Q. I'm not sure if I had asked you earlier. I think I had mentioned Julie McCormick as being possibly a subject of those concerns about hiring. Are you aware of whether that was a topic that came up at the all-staff meeting?

MR. COLLAER: Objection, that's been asked and
answered, but go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
(Reporter clarification.)
THE WITNESS: I said yes, you know, I've
already answered that, and that was that it was my -- if
I restate, what I said before was I thought it was just about Laura, I did not believe that it was about Julie.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) I just couldn't recall. I'm sorry. At any point in time did you hear of staff concerns about Ms. McCormick having been promoted to the position of supervising safety and security officer without having enough supervisory experience?
A. I did not hear that, no.
Q. No one ever told you that that was a concern?
A. No.
Q. And that would include Betty Grimm or Julie Cloud?
A. Right.
Q. Okay.
A. I did not hear that there was concern.
Q. Do you know if Pat Thomson from Human

Resources ever told any employees that there should be no more petitions?
A. I don't know that. I don't know that he said that.
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Q. All right. Did you ever hear that he did?
A. No.
Q. In your role as the superintendent, do you have a job description, a written job description?
A. I believe you're asking me in my role as the Director?
Q. Did I say "superintendent"?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm sorry.
A. It's listed, my responsibilities are listed in the Juvenile Corrections Act, you know, what I'm responsible for. As far as a specific job description, I've never seen one.
Q. Is there anyone more responsible than you are for the security of the facility?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question as vague, calls for speculation, also calls for a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Everyone is responsible for the security of the facility, everyone that works there and ultimately me.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Is it fair to say that the buck stops with you?

MR. COLLAER: The same objection.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) You can still answer.
A. Ultimately the Department is my responsibility.
Q. With respect to the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act, IDAPA, does that apply to the manner in which juvenile corrections centers are to be operated?
A. No, it's not, but there is a piece in there that says that the -- what we do with contract providers should be no stricter than what we do at our facilities. But we do not have to comply with those, nor are we licensed.
Q. What do you mean by "licensed"?
A. Our facilities aren't licensed.
Q. By whom?
A. Anybody.
Q. Who would license the facility?
A. The contract providers are licensed by the Department of Health and Welfare.
Q. Why is it that facilities are not licensed? I mean, is there a structural reason for that or -- I just don't know.

MR. COLLAER: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) If you know.
A. Because we are a department ourselves.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry, it seems obvious to you but
not to me.
MR. COLLAER: Counsel, it's been just over an hour. Is this a good time to take a short break? I presume you're going to need to go till about 5:00. MR. SCHOPPE: I'm not quite sure yet. We'll assume so but hope for something better than that.

MR. COLLAER: Sure.
(Recess held.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) With respect to the manner in which lockdowns are now treated in O\&A, do those same policies or rules apply in other parts of -- or in any of the other juvenile corrections centers?
A. As far as the 24 -hour due process and all of that, if a young person needs to remain to be locked down, that there has to be a due process hearing every 24 hours, yes.
Q. And how about with respect to detention centers? Do the same rules apply?

MR. COLLAER: Are you talking about state facilities or what?
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) If there's a difference, please educate me. We'll start with state facilities.
A. State facilities are under our jurisdiction and the policy applies. Detention facilities are county facilities and it's county rules. So, you know, they
have a different set of criteria.
Q. Do you know what criteria it is that they follow?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Is the National Juvenile Justice -- are you familiar with a group called National Juvenile Justice or something like that? Does it ring any kind of a bell?
A. There is the Coalition of Juvenile Justice, CJJ, that is national. There is the National Juvenile Detention Association. There's CJCA, which we've already talked about. I don't know of a National Juvenile Justice.
Q. Did Mr. Knoff provide you with a study on the guidelines that he had been applying to lockdowns in O\&A?
A. Mr. Knoff provided me with some information and he had done some research. And that research, he looked at detention facilities, which are, you know, a different facility than institutions, state correctional institutions.
Q. At some point did you take the view that Mr. Knoff was not following your instructions with respect to the lockdown policy in O\&A?
A. Mr. Knoff worked for Superintendent Grimm, you
know. So, she knew what -- that if kids were going to be locked down that they had to have due process every 24 hours.
Q. Who was it that made the decision to terminate Mr. Knoff?
A. That would have been his supervisor.
Q. Ms. Grimm?
A. Yes.
Q. Have there been any changes to the way in which staff, whether security staff or rehab staff or anyone else, are supposed to react to angry or upset juveniles wandering around the facility, whether by impeding their progress or following them around, anything like that?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, it's vague, compound.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) It is vague and compound, I'll grant you that, but I think it actually relates to the staff assists that I had mentioned earlier.
A. Okay.
Q. And I understand that that's kind of the equivalent thing there, if that helps you understand.

MR. COLLAER: Counsel, if you have a document or something she can look at, maybe that can help you.

MR. SCHOPPE: I don't.

THE WITNESS: I can tell you that what the new superintendent is doing is rather than restrain kids that are getting up and walking to their room, what she's asking is to help them de-escalate their behavior so that we have less restraints at that facility. And if that's what you mean by "staff assists" to help them go to their room or staff assists to walk with them, then yes, I am aware of that.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Why is it important that there be fewer restraints?
A. Because if we have fewer restraints, we're working with kids in a programmatic structure to help them provide -- to provide them with skills to de-escalate their anger.
Q. Is that something that's supposed to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis?
A. It should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
Q. Have you ever heard of any staff express any concern that that policy that you've just described posed a danger to juveniles or staff?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Or that it might result in -- or does result in damage to state property?
A. No, I have not. I have not heard that that
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particular change inus working to de-escalate kids has promoted damage to state property.
Q. Have you heard of any rumors of sexual abuse of juveniles on the part of former employee Valerie Lietau?
A. I have not specifically heard those rumors. I heard that last week at Betty's deposition.
Q. Are you aware of any pending investigations into allegations like that?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. The same thing with respect to former employee Marcie Harris.
A. No, not to my knowledge or recollection.
Q. Do you know if Ms. Harris was ever disciplined for kissing a juvenile?
A. I can't even remember Marcie Harris, to tell you the truth.
Q. That's okay. The same question with respect to Lisa Bradley.
A. What is the question again?
Q. Are you aware of any reports or rumors of allegations of sexual abuse of juveniles on her part?
A. No, I am not.
Q. I don't mean to keep you hanging, but it's a good thing if I'm crossing things off on this outline of
mine.
Are you aware of whether Julie McCormick ever expressed a bias against hiring veterans or correctional officers or law enforcement?
A. I'm not aware of that.
Q. Do you know one way or the other whether veterans are supposed to be given special treatment in connection with hiring decisions?
A. Yes, they get additional points. So, they go to the top of the list.
Q. That's the one star, two star system?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever heard the report that Betty Grimm had a preference against hiring veterans or correctional of ficers or law enforcement?
A. No, I have never heard that. We have a lot of past correctional officers and veterans at all three of our facilities.
Q. Did you ever have any concern that Laura Roters might take legal action in connection with the revocation of the offer of the unit manager position to her?
A. I don't know if I had that concern, but I guess it could have happened.
Q. Do you know if the decision was made to hire

Ms. Roters for the unit manager position the first time around before all of the other applicants were interviewed?
A. So --

MR. COLLAER: Could you repeat the question, please.

THE WITNESS: Could you ask that --
MR. COLLAER: Could you read the question back.
(Record read back.)
THE WITNESS: No.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Are you aware of any allegations of time card fraud involving Roberto Coronado?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. How about regarding LaMark Judkins?
A. No, I'm not. Oh, aware of any time card fraud with LaMark?
Q. Or allegations of that.
A. No.
Q. Debbie Siegel?
A. No.
Q. Maria Ferrara?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if Julie Cloud was monitoring

Rhonda Ledford's communications, e-mail or people she spoke with in 2011?
A. I know Julie Cloud was monitoring it after the lawsuit was filed for a bit, but 2011 would have been before the lawsuit.
Q. Okay.
A. So, no.
Q. Do you know why Ms. Cloud was monitoring Ms. Ledford's communications or e-mails after the lawsuit was filed?
A. No, I just was made aware that she was.
Q. Did you ever speak with her about that?
A. I -- she told me that she was monitoring.
Q. She didn't tell you why?
A. No.
Q. Did you wonder why?
A. Well, I figured it had to do with the lawsuit. And, you know, anybody can monitor our e-mails at any time.
Q. Is that standard practice with employees who file lawsuits?
A. This is the first lawsuit, so -- that has been filed.
Q. Do youknow if she was monitoring the e-mail of any other Plaintiff?
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A. No, I don't. I don't know that.
Q. Is there any special process that she would have had to have gone through to request that type of access, as far as you know?
A. She would have had to go through IT.
Q. As far as you know, are there any criteria that govern that kind of access?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. I'm not sure if I asked you about Ms. Cloud and Ms. Grimm monitoring Ms. Ledford's communications in 2011. Are you aware of whether Ms. Grimm was monitoring those communications and e-mails?
A. I was not aware of that.
Q. Can you think of any reasons why they might have been doing that, if they were?

MR. COLLAER: Objection to the form of the question, calls for speculation. If you know what they were thinking, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I don't know what they were thinking, no, if they were doing it.
Q. (BYMR. SCHOPPE) Do you know of any reason why Ms. Ledford's communications should have been monitored in 2011 ?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, it's vague and calls for speculation.

Sharon Harrigfeld
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THE WITNESS: Again, I didn't know they were being monitored, so I don't know the answer to that, no.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) But you don't know of any reason all by yourself?
A. All by myself, I would know no reason to monitor Rhonda Ledford's e-mails.
Q. Do you know if Ms. Cloud ever said that, "Ms. Ledford keeps things stirred at the facility"?
A. I had heard that. I don't know if it was Julie that told me that, but I had heard -- I have heard that.
Q. Do you know who you've heard that from?
A. No.
Q. Do you know what that meant?
A. No, I just had heard it.
Q. Did you have the impression that that was a bad thing when you heard it?
A. I don't know if I had an impression that it was a good thing or a bad thing, to tell you the truth.
Q. Did you ever hear any allegations from anyone including Ms. Cloud that Rhonda was gossiping with anyone?
A. I hadn't heard that. The pot stirring I had heard. I hadn't heard the gossiping.
Q. Had you ever heard any allegation that
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Ms. Ledford was disgruntling or riling other employees?
A. No, I hadn't heard that. I mean, before the lawsuit.
Q. Had you heard that since the lawsuit?
A. Well, just the people that were involved in the lawsuit. I mean, I just -- those people that were involved in the lawsuit, I figured that she had talked with them. But I hadn't heard that, I had just figured that those people were, you know, that she had talked with those folks.
Q. Let me ask you about discipline against the Plaintiffs. Have you ever had any involvement in disciplinary actions involving Rhonda Ledford, to start with?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question, assumes that disciplinary action was ever taken. Could you identify what action you're talking about?

MR. SCHOPPE: Any disciplinary action.
MR. COLLAER: The same objection.
THE WITNESS: I am made aware of actions, but as far as disciplinary actions, it's really the supervisor and the facility superintendent that is responsible for disciplinary actions in all three of the facilities.

9/23/2013
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Did you have any involvement in developing a disciplinary action against Ms. Ledford in connection with a comment that she made at an all-staff meeting to the effect that she said "Really"?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question as incomplete. What disciplinary action are you referring to?

MR. SCHOPPE: Any disciplinary action.
MR. COLLAER: If you're aware of any, describe it. If it's connected to that, describe it.

THE WITNESS: That wasn't really an all-staff meeting. It was Betty's retirement. And as far as disciplinary action, I did call her in to my office and talk with her about that. But as far as -- I mean, I talked with her directly about that. And as far as what we agreed to is that that would not go into her personnel file.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) What was your concern at the time?
A. It was not promoting a respectful workplace.
Q. What was not promoting a respectful workplace?
A. Leaving a retirement party and saying
"Really."
Q. Do you know why she left?
A. Why she left?
Q. Yes.
A. She left to do her work. I had no problem
with her leaving. I had a problem with her saying
"Really" as she was walking out the door.
Q. You viewed that as disrespectful?
A. Yes.
Q. Towards whom?
A. It was I believe that Betty was giving kudos
to Laura for what was happening in O\&A and thanking her for that.
Q. And what was --
A. And that's --
Q. I'm sorry, go ahead.
A. That's kind of what I remember. It had to do with Laura. And as far as the specifics of what that was about, I can't really recall, but as Rhonda left she said "Really" that everyone heard.
Q. And what was it that Ms. Roters was being congratulated for in O\&A?
A. Well, that's what I said. I can't really recall all of that, what it was about, but it was Betty's retirement and she was just kind of talking about what was going on in the facility.
Q. Have you ever heard of reports that Ms. Roters was disrespectful to staff or juveniles?
A. I have not heard that. That has not come to my attention.
Q. Have you ever heard that she called a juvenile a "dumb ass"?
A. I read that in I think some of the stuff that you -- that Phil had. Prior to that I had no idea that that had happened.
Q. Do you know if any steps have been taken to investigate whether that happened?
A. I don't know because I didn't -- I hadn't heard about it up to that point.
Q. After you did hear about it, did you look into the situation?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Any particular reason why not?
A. I'm not Laura's supervisor.
Q. Is that the kind of thing that you would want a supervisor to look into?
A. If it had been reported, yes.
Q. And I said this before, but pardon the vulgarity. Have you ever heard that Laura Roters called a former employee a "cunt"?
A. No, I have never heard that.
Q. Would you regard that as more or less serious than Ms. Ledford's "really" comment?
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MR. COLLAER: Object to the form, it's vague and it's an incomplete hypothetical, assumes facts not in evidence.

THE WITNESS: I don't know the context.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Is there any context in which calling someone that word, the C word, would be appropriate?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall being involved at any point in the consideration of Ms. Ledford's family medical leave application in 2011 ?
A. I was made aware of it. It was -- it was something between her and her supervisor that they were working on.
Q. Apart from what we've already talked about, have you ever been involved in any other disciplinary action involving Ms. Ledford?
A. Disciplinary action?
Q. Yes.
A. Have I been involved in it?
Q. Yes.
A. 1 mean, I've been made aware. Not involved.
Q. Have you ever been involved in any disciplinary action involving Tom de Knijf?
A. I have been made aware and -- I've been made
aware of disciplinary action and involved when it has
come to my level, yes.
Q. And what was your involvement?
A. The last disciplinary action, there was a NOCA delivered and a response to the NOCA. And I supported the response and we changed the disciplinary action as a result of the response that Mr. De Knijf provided.
Q. Do you recall if that response included reference to Ms. Roters calling a juvenile a "dumb ass"?
A. No, I don't recall that.
Q. Have you been involved in any disciplinary action involving Diane Miles?
A. I haven't been involved in any disciplinary actions. I've been made aware. Again, because I'm not her supervisor, I've been made aware of those.
Q. What were you made aware of?
A. That she received a second DUI.
Q. And was there a disciplinary action -- and did that happen in March of this year as far as you know?
A. I can't remember exactly when that happened, but that seems -- it is about that time frame.
Q. And what was the disciplinary action taken against her?
A. Again, I was made aware that I believe it was turned over to POST. You know, we have to report any
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kind of criminal activity to POST.
Q. Does POST have any kind of requirements on criminal backgrounds in making hiring decisions?
A. Yes, they do have requirements.
Q. Can you tell me about those?
A. You cannot be POST certified if you a felony charge. If you have misdemeanors, you have to go before the hearing board and ask for a waiver.
Q. Do you know if Julie McCormick had criminal charges before she was hired at the Department?
A. I don't know. None of the - none of that stuff gets to my level unless, you know, like it's a felony charge or something like that that I may or may not get told about. So, no, I don't recall that.
Q. Are you aware of whether Diane Miles drove herself to work on a suspended driver's license following her second DUI charge?
A. I am not aware that she did. I did receive a phone call from Lynn Viner asking me if I knew what kind of car she drove so that they could determine that. And I told her I had no idea what kind of car she drove.
Q. Are you aware of whether she transported juveniles while on a suspended license?
A. No, I am not aware that she transported juveniles while on a suspended license.
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Q. Do you know anything about expectations that a supervisor might craft for particular employees, in terms of like not quite a job description but a set of expectations?
A. Supervisors craft expectations all of the time. When I hire new staff that are at the division administrator level, I sit down and talk with them about what my expectations are. So, my guess is a lot of supervisors do talk with their staff about what their expectations are.
Q. Are those expectations typically applied across the board to all employees of a particular classification, like SSOs or rehab techs, or are those more unique, as far as you know?
A. Well, I would assume those would be more unique based on what -- because even within each of those classifications there would be different job duties and responsibilities that staff would undertake. And so, depending upon what the supervisor's expectations are for the overall management of their -all of their staff, I would assume that it would depend upon what each one of those -- each one of those relationships between supervisor and employee would be.
Q. Are you aware of whether the Plaintiffs'
communications are monitored or have been monitored
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since the filing of the lawsuit, apart from what we've already talked about?
A. Apart from what we've already talked about as far as Rhonda's, I'm not aware, no.
Q. You don't know if anybody is keeping track of who they're talking to or anything like that?
A. You mean recording? Who is -- who they're talking to and -- I'm not aware of that, no.
Q. Have you ever been involved in any disciplinary action involving Shane Penrod?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of -- have you ever been
involved in any problem solving process involving Shane Penrod?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that about?
A. That was about -- Shane came to me with his attorney to talk about his change in shifts and we -- he presented his case. And I did some research on the change in shifts that dealt with some cross-training and some different things.
Q. Was the reason for his change in shift disciplinary?
A. It's cross-training.
Q. It was not disciplinary?
A. No.
Q. Did he ever indicate that Julie McCormick had told him that it was disciplinary in nature?
A. Not to my knowledge. What we talked about was the cross-training and the importance of having some -all staff know all of the different roles and responsibilities of safety and security officers. And he had been transporting, and just the value of some of his skills and -- being provided for other safety and security officers. And then also other safety and security officers understanding what transport was all about so there was an ability to cover shifts.
Q. Was there a program that existed of any kind for that kind of cross-training?
A. That would have been up to the supervisor.
Q. That would have been Julie McCormick at the time?
A. At the time, yes.
Q. Do you know if any other employees' shifts were changed for that purpose, cross-training?
A. They would have had to have been in order for Shane's shift to have been changed. Other employees would have had to have changed their shifts, but I can't recall who it was.
Q. Was that program supposed to apply to all
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employees?
A. All employees at JCC Nampa? All employees within a job class? All employees -- I don't understand your question.
Q. How about those that were under Ms. McCormick's supervision?
A. The way it was presented to me is that she wanted all of her staff to be able to do any of the expectations under the safety and security officer position at JCC Nampa.
Q. Did she specify a time frame for that cross-training rescheduling?
A. No.
Q. Is that sort of scheduling up to a supervisor or is that something that Director Grimm might mandate?
A. The scheduling is up to the supervisor.
Q. Superintendent, I'm sorry.
A. The scheduling is up to the supervisor. And Superintendent Grimm would not have had any direct contact with what that scheduling was.
Q. Do you know of any reason why Ms. Grimm might have wanted to keep Shane Penrod off of day shifts?
A. I don't know of any reason why she would want to keep him off day shifts.
Q. Did she ever indicate to you that she might
want to keep him off day shifts?
A. Ms. Grimm to me?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been involved in any
disciplinary action involving Lisa Littlefield?
A. No.
Q. Or how about any problem solving process involving her?
A. I can't recall even being involved in any problem solving with Lisa.
Q. Did you ever hear from anyone that

Ms. Littlefield had questioned Ms. Roters' qualifications for the position of unit manager in O\&A?
A. No, I didn't know that she had questioned that.
Q. Were you ever aware of Ms. Littlefield ever expressing any unhappiness or dissatisfaction with Ms. Roters as the O\&A unit manager?
A. It had not been brought to my attention. And I did talk to Ms. Littlefield when I was out there on Sundays and she didn't bring it to my attention.
Q. What did you talk about?
A. Mostly just, "How are you doing? What's going on? And how about them Bears?" She's a Chicago Bears
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fan, so --
Q. Yes, she is. Have you ever had any
involvement in any disciplinary process against -- a proceeding against Gracie Reyna?
A. No.
Q. How about any problem solving process involving her?
A. No, it was brought to my attention that she was not getting weekend -- I mean, she was having to ask for time off if she wanted a weekend off. That was brought to my attention as far as scheduling, and Human Resources brought that to my attention. I said, "Would you please make sure that Tom is fair and equitable to everybody and everybody gets weekends, you know, that it's fair and equitable." That's the only Gracie Reyna discussion that I've had with anybody.
Q. Were you ever made aware or were you ever told that she was considered to be belligerent or challenging by Ms. Grimm or Ms. Roters?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever had any involvement in any disciplinary proceeding involving Frank Farmworth?
A. I was made aware of a disciplinary proceeding. I wasn't directly involved in it.
Q. Do you remember what that concerned?
A. That was the whole process, I mean, of him getting angry with a kid.
Q. Is that what you heard?
A. Getting angry with a kid, yes, that's what I heard.
Q. And who told you that?
A. Superintendent Grimm.
Q. Did she say where she had heard that?
A. I believe there was a disciplinary action that had taken place as a result of that.
Q. All right. Did you ever discuss this lawsuit with Frank?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. When was that?
A. I went out there. I can't remember under -- I can't remember why I was out there, but I said, "If anybody wants to talk, you know, please come in and talk with me." And Frank came in to talk about the lawsuit. I mean, he talked about the colors of his shirts.
Q. What else did he have to say?
A. He said that he had been stressed since the lawsuit started and that because of that his wife had said, "Look at the shirts that you're wearing. Prior to that, you know, you were wearing brightly colored shirts and happy shirts and now obviously you're stressed
Q. Was anybody else there when you talked with him?
A. Yes, Nancy Bishop was with me.
Q. You understood that Frank was a Plaintiff at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. After your meeting with Frank, did you speak with his supervisor, Jeanette Angell, at all?
A. No.
Q. Did you speak with Julie Cloud or Pat Thomson or anyone in Human Resources regarding Frank after that discussion with him?
A. I may have talked with them about that and the fact that he was thinking about pulling out of the lawsuit because of his stress.
Q. Did you talk about anything else with them in that regard?
A. No.
Q. Have you had any involvement in any disciplinary proceeding involving Addison Fordham?
A. No.
Q. How about any problem solving processes involving him?
A. Not that I recall. I don't recall anything
with Addison Fordham.
Q. And I had skipped that section with

Ms. Ledford. Have you ever been involved in any problem solving processes with her?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that about?
A. That was about -- I actually went out to the
facility and we talked about her FML and the stress that she was under.
Q. Did she tell you why she was stressed?
A. We -- what I remember us talking about, the specific was her disciplinary action on -- I can't remember exactly, but she was asked to leave the AUF training because she was upset. And in our discussion, we determined that there were some things that were in the disciplinary action that could be pulled out, and we pulled a lot of the stuff that we discussed out of that disciplinary action.
Q. Have you ever been involved in any
disciplinary process or proceeding against Jo McKinney?
A. No.
Q. How about a problem solving process?
A. No, not with Jo.
Q. Are you aware that Jo has alleged age
discrimination in the workplace?
A. With the lawsuit, yes.
Q. Are you aware of anyone in Jo's office or any
of her co-workers expressing any negative or derogatory comments about her age?
A. No, I am not aware of any of those.
Q. Have you ever investigated those allegations yourself?
A. I have not. I know that Human Resources did and did not come up with anything.
Q. Did they issue a written report on that?
A. I don't know if they issued a written report.
Q. Do you know who investigated that?
A. Julie looked into it.
Q. Julie Cloud?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not sure if I've already asked you about Kim McCormick. Did you ever participate in any disciplinary proceedings against her?
A. No, 1 haven't. You asked me about -- I think I told you retaliation. That's our discussion with Kim.
Q. And was that a problem solving discussion or was that just a discussion?
A. It was just a discussion.

MR. SCHOPPE: If we can take a break, I have a few exhibits to go through. I just want to pull those
together.
MR. COLLAER: Okay.
MR. SCHOPPE: Off the record.
(Recess held.)
MR. SCHOPPE: Okay, back on the record.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Are you aware of an incident involving sort of a field trip of juveniles with staff to Shafer Butte last year, 2012?
A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
Q. And what is it that you know about that?
A. I know that there was a field trip up there and that one of the staff got caught in a ravine. And so, it took them longer to get him out than they thought.
Q. Do you know whether the staff involved were following the Department policy of eyes on juveniles at all times?
A. It was my understanding that yes, they were, that the kids, you know, had supervision. And I actually asked afterwards if that was the case because I had heard otherwise that it wasn't. And I was told that yes, there were eyes on the juveniles at all times.
Q. All right. And who did you ask about that?
A. I asked Betty to look into it for me and she did.
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Q. Do you recall the staff members involved?
A. I -- it was Nicholas Tinker's group and so he was the group leader. I don't recall the other staff.
Q. Are you aware of staff ever reporting concems about unidentified visitors being allowed into the Department facilities?
A. No.
Q. Or visitors without identification?
A. Okay, so you mean visitors coming to the facility to visit kids without identification?
Q. Yes.
A. I am not aware of that. I was made aware of that at Betty's deposition.
Q. Is that something that is against Department policy?
A. What's against Department policy is for visitors to be allowed that aren't part of the approved visitors list.
Q. Do you know whether or not juveniles are permitted to wear gang colors at JCC Nampa?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Would that be a violation of policy?

MR. COLLAER: Object to the form of the question as vague. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I mean, I -- kids are, when they
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get to the reintegration level they can wear their own clothes. So, you know, I don't know if in that -- it would not be appropriate for them to wear gang colors, but I'm not aware that they're allowed to wear gang colors. Do they get around that? I mean, across the nation if everybody is wearing the same uniform, they'll figure out a way to determine that. So, I don't -- I don't know. It has not been brought to my attention that kids are wearing gang colors. No one has told me that that's what's happening and that it's being allowed.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Have any staff ever -- or have you ever heard that staff have reported concerns about juveniles escaping -- let me narrow that down -concerns about it being too easy for juveniles to escape the JCC Nampa facility in particular?
A. Right after 1 became the Director kids escaped by climbing up on a building and jumping off. But as far as -- I mean, I wasn't made aware of that. And we changed how that structure was so that -- but up to -you know, since then I've not been made aware of it being easy for kids to escape from JCC Nampa.
Q. Have you ever heard of reports by staff to the effect that contraband in the possession of juveniles can be used for weapons or other dangerous purposes?
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A. I'm sorry, would you ask that question again.
Q. Sure. Have you ever heard of reports by staff that contraband within the facility can be used as weapons by juveniles?
A. I have been made aware of contraband that has been found in the facility that could have been used as weapons by the juveniles, if that was the question that you were asking.
Q. Are you aware of any steps that have been taken to ensure that juveniles can't create weapons?
A. Yes, staff on an ongoing basis look at ways to assure that kids can't be creating weapons. And if there are objects that are missing, then there's a search of the rooms at all three facilities.
Q. Is that a policy that's followed at JCC Nampa in practice?
A. Yes, to my knowledge it is followed.
Q. All right, I have a few documents to ask you about. If you can take a look at that document, let me know if it's something you recognize. And take your time.
A. (Reviewing document.)
Q. Can you identify that document?
A. It's a -- I was copied on it. It's a thank
you note from Betty Grimm to both Julie and Pat on their
spending time with Julie McCormick and Betty one
afternoon, and provided guidance for -- it looks to me
for their continued assistance once Ms. Ledford returns to Nampa.
Q. Do you know what that was about, what that referred to or why you would have been copied on that?
A. Probably because I'm Betty's supervisor. And my guess is --

MR. COLLAER: Don't guess on anything. If you know, you know.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm sure I was copied because I'm Betty's supervisor.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Does she copy you on all of her e-mails?
A. A lot of her e-mails, yes.
Q. Do you know what the particular issue was that Ms. Grimm was concerned with about Ms. Ledford returning to Nampa?

MR. COLLAER: Objection to the form of the question, calls for a -- assumes facts not in evidence, calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: No. Betty would periodically copy me on e-mails especially with other people that I am -- that I supervise. So, in this case what I would see that I could use is the customer assistance that
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Julie provided, so that in her performance evaluation I could say that, "It looks like you've created good customer assistance."
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) All right. So, is it fair to say that you're not sure what it was that Ms. Grimm was seeking continued assistance with with respect to Ms. Ledford?
A. No, I don't know what that was about.
Q. Okay, that's fine. If you can hand that over to the Court Reporter there we'll mark that as the next exhibit whenever you're ready.
(Exhibit 144 marked.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) All right, here is the next one. And the same drill. If you can take a look at it, let me know what that document is. Take all of the time you need.

MR. COLLAER: Are you going to have this marked?

MR. SCHOPPE: Yes.
MR. COLLAER: So, that will be 145 ?
THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
(Exhibit 145 marked.)
THE WITNESS: (Reviewing document.) Okay. So, this would have been in March and it would have -so, obviously I sent it to all staff. And someone had
voiced concerns and to tell you the truth, I can't remember who had voiced concerns, but what I'm telling people is, you know, "Don't keep it quiet. If there's something, then bring it forward."
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) All right. So, you don't recall who brought those concerns to your attention?
A. No. I can't even tell you if this had to do with Nampa or St. Anthony or Lewiston.
Q. With respect to the violations of state and federal laws in reference to "discrimination, harassment, retaliation, sexual misconduct, violation of ethics, and other issues" that are laid out in that e-mail, do you have any recollection as to what it was you had heard?
A. No, I really don't have any recollection.
Q. Do you have any idea who it was that had raised, made those, quote, "vague references"?

MR. COLLAER: Objection, that's been asked and answered, but go ahead.

THE WITNESS: No. Again, as I said, I can't remember if this was even from Lewiston, Nampa, or St. Anthony.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) After this do you recall if anyone came to you with their concerns?
A. No, I don't recall. But I did Director's

Reflections ongoing asking people, "If you have any issues, please give me a call."
Q. Okay, that's good for that one. Thank you.

Here is another document here.
(Exhibit 146 marked.)
THE WITNESS: (Reviewing document.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Is that a document that you recognize?
A. I recognize this document. This is after the lawsuit has been filed.
Q. Okay.
A. And it's a matter of -- there was a lot of just unrest at the Nampa facility and just making sure that everybody is respectful of each other.
Q. Do you know what the gossiping and rumors were?
A. I don't know specifically what the gossiping and rumors were, but I wanted -- you know, I totally supported this e-mail going out and wanting people to do their jobs.
(Exhibit 147 marked.)
MR. SCHOPPE: This will be Exhibit No. 147?
THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay, so, this is to Vicki.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) So, that's an e-mail you
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A. Yes.
Q. Is this also after the lawsuit was filed?
A. Yes.
Q. And Vicki works with the Division of Human

Resources; is that right?
A. Yes, she does.
Q. What is her title there?
A. She is the -- well, she's the division administrator of the Division of Human Resources.
Q. Did you hear back from her in response to your request that she call you?
A. I'm sure I did, yes.
Q. Do you recall what you might have spoken about with her after that?
A. I don't recall, but I remember getting together with her, which is probably when this was, is to talk about what next steps I needed to do --
Q. Okay.
A. -- for the Department, in making sure that we could continue moving the Department forward.
Q. That's what was on your mind when you wrote this e-mail?
A. Yes.
Q. And what did she tell you about those next

Page 161 steps?
A. At one point, I don't know if it was in that conversation or some time through there, we talked about her staff possibly coming out and doing some training on culture change and helping staff understand changes in culture. And both she and Kim Toryanski said, "You know, if you want to do that, then we can come out and do some training."
Q. What did you mean by "culture change"?
A. What Vicki believed is that maybe part of the reason that people were unhappy with -- unhappy at Nampa was because they were unhappy with the culture of the facility.
Q. Any people in particular?
A. No, I -- what I said is, "What can I do to make sure that we continue to move forward with the Department?" And the response was, "You know, if you want us to help with some culture change."
Q. Did that ever happen?
A. No.
Q. Any idea why not?
A. There's so much going on at the Department that we figured we would just get things kind of settled down again.
Q. Okay, thank you.
A. You're welcome.
Q. That's all for that one.
(Exhibit 148 marked.)
THE WITNESS: Yes, I remember this e-mail.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Okay, you reference at the top: "Some of the questions I won't answer because of the lawsuit." What questions were you referring to?
A. There was a promotional video that PbS was doing and I just told them when I went to Houston that, "We are in the middle of the lawsuit." And I didn't know what questions they were going to ask, but I just wanted them to know that we were in the middle of a lawsuit and that some things I just wouldn't -- I wouldn't answer.
Q. All right. Speaking of lawsuits, was there a lawsuit filed by Diane Floyd-Miller that you're aware of?
A. Yes. That was before my time. It was -- it started before my time.
Q. Are you aware of what those allegations were?
A. I can't recall what those allegations were. I know we settled.
Q. Do you recall if that was a whistle-blower lawsuit as well?
A. I don't recall what it was because like I
said, it was before my time.
Q. Before your time as Director, you mean?
A. Before my time as Director where I would get involved in that type of personnel information.
Q. Have you ever submitted -- I know I had asked you about deposition testimony before. Have you ever submitted any affidavits in connection with any lawsuit or claim made against the Department?
A. Not to my knowledge. But again, Andrew, remember, I'm not an attorney so there could have been something that I did, but not to my knowledge, I did not.
Q. That's all I need. Whatever you know yourself.
A. Okay.
Q. If I wanted to look at statistics regarding safety within The Department of Juvenile Corrections at any of the facilities and with respect to incidents of violence involving staff or juveniles, things like that, is there a resource that I could look at? Like is there a PbS publication or any kind of numbers that are published by the Department?
A. That are published by the Department? I don't -- there is PbS data that we could pull for you. Do we publish that? We provide ongoing reports to the
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leadership team, but as far as publishing data, we can pull that information for you, but we don't -- I mean, there's not a report that says: "These are our" -- you know, we work on providing that information to the leadership team.
Q. All right. Who is the leadership team?
A. It's -- the leadership team is made up of the three superintendents, which are Kevin Bernatz, Skip Greene, and Lynn Viner. Mike Seifrit with IT, Scott Johnson with administrative services, Marcy Chadwell with the community operations and program services, Julie Cloud with Human Resources. Our staff support is Zane Baird and Monty Prow, who is quality improvement. I just put Monty Prow on the leadership team, and me.
Q. And do you meet regularly?
A. Yes. I can't remember anybody else that's on it, but yes, we meet regularly. We meet all day once a month and a half day if there's -- if there are things that we need to discuss. But there's an all-day meeting once a month.
(Exhibit 149 marked.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) Here is the next document. I think we're at 149 now.
A. (Reviewing document.) I do remember this e-mail.
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Q. Okay.
A. So -- yes, I do remember this e-mail.
Q. Okay.
A. I had forgotten about that until just now.
Q. With respect to paragraph 2, a portion, would you mind reading that starting with "Julie's reason."
A. "Julie's reason for wanting a new list is that many have backgrounds that are military, policy, or corrections and they tend to be black and white and she wants someone more gray. However, she has not talked with them. It is only on paper that she is basing her decision."
Q. Did it give you any cause for concern that she was indicating any kind of a preference against interviewing or hiring applicants with military backgrounds?
A. She ended up going back and interviewing the staff. So, you know, that's why it was a done deal. No, she went back and interviewed. We didn't do a new hiring list.
Q. Did it concern you that she had ranked that as a quality that she apparently viewed as negative?
A. Yes, it did concern me. However, I did forget that this had happened.
Q. Okay.
A. So, I apologize for that.
Q. That's all right. Did you ever address that specific point with her, with respect to applicants with military backgrounds?
A. With Julie McCormick directly?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I would not have. I would have directed that to Betty and had Betty. Because Betty was her supervisor, I wasn't.
Q. All right. Did you ask Betty to do that?
A. I am sure I did talk with her about that because she did end up interviewing folks from that list.
Q. And you're sure that you spoke with her about the veterans, military background issue?
A. I am 95 percent sure.
Q. All right. Do you know when it was that you would have spoken about that with Betty?
A. Probably February 23rd.
Q. All right.
A. Or February 22nd.
Q. Pretty quickly?
A. Right, yeah.
Q. Do you know if Julie Cloud ever indicated any concern over Ms. McCormick stating that she viewed
military background as a negative?
A. Well, obviously she did because she sent this e-mail to me. So, she was concerned about it as well.
Q. All right. Did she indicate anywhere in the e-mail that you can see that she viewed it as a legal issue or inappropriate or risky to the Department not to want to interview or hire military background applicants?
A. Well, I don't see it as illegal or inappropriate. I see it as the right thing to do because she's wanting to go down the list to figure out if any of these would be appropriate for our Department, instead of assuming based on the fact that they're military or Department of Corrections that they would think black and white instead of gray.
Q. All right. Do you know at this point how long Ms. McCormick would have been in charge of considering applicants?
A. No, I wouldn't know.

MR. SCHOPPE: I think I may be done, if I can just get two minutes to just double check.

MR. COLLAER: Sure.
(Discussion held off the record.)
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) All right, just a last few things. Are juveniles who are over the age of 18 kept
in the Department under any circumstance?
A. Yes, we can keep kids in our Department until the age of 21 . To keep them over the age of 19 they have to go before the Custody Review Board, but we have jurisdiction until their 21 st birthday.
Q. Is that a statutory grant?
A. Yes, it's a statutory. It's in the statute.
Q. Are there particular criteria that are used to decide who stays and who gets either released or transferred to the adult system?
A. Well, let me kind of explain. The criteria for the kids that are in our custody under the Juvenile Corrections Act, they have to go before the Custody Review Board. The Custody Review Board are the ones that determine whether or not they stay with us. Their retention rate is probably about 95 percent, I think. Most kids end up being retained with us.

As far as going on to the correctional facility, those are kids that are blended sentences. So, they committed a crime that is -- has been waived to the adult court. And those kids -- it really depends on how it works. Those kids can stay with us until their 21 st birthday or they can transfer over to the adult system.

We have indeterminate sentencing for the kids
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that are under the Juvenile Corrections Act, which means we determine how long they stay in our system. But in adult corrections it's really the judge that determines, number one, whether or not they stay within our system and number two, if when they're done with programming in our system whether or not they go to the adult system.
Q. All right, thank you.
A. You're welcome.
Q. That's very educational actually. With respect to recidivism, when juveniles who have been in the system go out and commit another crime and also perhaps another crime -- suppose they've been in the system for a burglary to start with and then they commit another crime, say a burglary and a drug offense. Is it the case that the lesser of the two charges is counted rather than the greater of the two?

MR. COLLAER: Counted in what way, Counsel?
MR. SCHOPPE: Counted for purposes of recidivism calculations.

THE WITNESS: Our recidivism calculations are based on a new conviction. So, it wouldn't matter what charge it was. They were convicted of a new crime, so it would count in the recidivism numbers.
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) So, every conviction for every crime?
A. Every conviction is -- so, if a juvenile commits two crimes, then they recidivated. They don't -- it's not double jeopardy. It's not two recidivism counts. It's one juvenile recidivated and so they had -- you know, they committed two crimes but they recidivated, and so that would count in our recidivism numbers.
Q. And is recidivism broken down into types of recidivism for particular crimes or types of offenses?
A. Yes, in -- yes and no. When we do an overall recidivism study that is much more involved and complicated, then yes. On a regular basis, like if you were to look at our Director's Dashboard, that is just a data dump. So, what that means is if a juvenile turns 18 , is released from us, and commits a crime as an adult, every night the court data is dumped into ours and so we would know automatically that a kid recidivated.
Q. All right. And in those circumstances where there is perhaps a more serious crime, like a violent assault coupled with a drug charge or something that might be more minor, are those assigned to one category or another? Are they counted under the less serious charge or the more serious charge?
A. I guess I'm still having trouble -- if
you're -- when a juvenile is committed to us, their crimes are listed in IJOS in, you know, what the committing crime is. That's the information that we use when a kid is committed to us, what's on the court order, if that's what you're meaning.

If you're meaning, if we're still talking about recidivism and we're discussing whether or not a kid recidivates and -- so, for instance, if a juvenile is committed to us on a burglary charge, they're released and they run away from home, those don't count as recidivism numbers because that's a status offense, it's only based on their age. If they commit a crime where they assaulted another person or they stole a car, that would count as a new charge. And depending upon what the charge is in the court order, that's what we would count.
Q. Going back to the situation involving

McCormick and CY did you ever become aware whether Diane Miles stood outside the door while Ms. McCormick was with CY for any period of time?
A. Yes, I was aware of that because I saw the video.
Q. And what did you see on the video?
A. I saw her standing outside for a bit.
Q. For how long?
A. I don't know how long it was.
Q. If I suggested it was 40 or 45 minutes, would that make sense to you?
A. I don't -- I really don't -- I don't know how long it was.
Q. Do you know what she was doing standing outside the door?
A. At the time, no, I didn't know what she was doing. I mean, I was surprised that she was standing outside the door. And the whole piece was concerning to me. That any staff at any of my facilities would allow another staff to be behind a closed door with one of our kids is inexcusable.
Q. Was any disciplinary action taken against her for that?
A. I don't know. That would have been her supervisor.
Q. How is it that you came to handle the "Really" disciplinary incident that we talked about earlier with respect to Ms. Ledford as opposed to Julie McCormick, her supervisor, handling it or even Betty Grimm?

MR. COLLAER: What disciplinary incident are you referring to?
Q. (BY MR. SCHOPPE) The "Really" incident where Ms. Ledford said "Really."
A. Well, again, as far as disciplinary, nothing was put in her personnel file. I just asked her to come down and talk to me to hear her side of the story.
Q. Was there a reason that wasn't left for her supervisor or Ms. Grimm to handle?
A. I was there. I saw it happen.
Q. Was there a reason, though? It sounds like ordinarily you would leave discipline up to a supervisor; is that fair?
A. Unless I'm present when the situation happens.
Q. Okay.
A. If that would happen in any of the facilities, I would ask to talk to the staff.
Q. After you had seen Diane Miles standing in front of the door on the video, is there a reason that you didn't handle that, because you became aware of that at that point?
A. It was being handled through the process and through the investigation and all of that. I felt like it was being handled.
Q. Did you know who was handling it?
A. Betty and all of her staff that were working through that whole procedure and process.

MR. SCHOPPE: All right. I'm going to have to close off, but I'm going to have to keep it open because
it sounds like we have this issue potentially with the Knoff settlement, but other than that I'm done.

MR. COLLAER: Nothing further. MR. SCHOPPE: Thank you for your time. (Deposition adjourned at 4:27 p.m.) (Signature requested.)
-oOo-
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